

## **APPENDIX A: KEY DECISIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENT SUMMARY**

## **Key Decisions from Steering Committee Work Sessions**

The WRIA 8 Steering Committee held eight six-hour work sessions from February through October 2004 during which they reviewed the *WRIA 8 Draft Plan Framework and Preliminary Actions List* (December 31, 2003 notebook) and the *June 30<sup>th</sup> Work Product on the WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan*. The Steering Committee provided direction on how to:

- Translate science into policy
- Propose site-specific habitat projects and landscape-level actions (land use and public outreach) to conserve salmon habitat
- Use adaptive management to create an implementation framework that includes a collaborative organization structure, a funding strategy, a monitoring and measures program, and recommendations for commitments from implementers and expectations for regulatory agencies.

The decisions that came out of these work sessions were used to develop the *WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan Public Review Draft*. Two additional work sessions were held in January 2005 to review public comments and provide guidance on plan revisions. Below are the key decisions recorded for each of the ten work sessions.

---

### **Key Decisions from WRIA 8 Steering Committee Work Session #1 February 10, 2004**

#### **Decisions are listed for the following topics:**

- Process for facilitated work sessions
- Overarching question: How Will the Conservation Plan Be Used?
- Process for prioritizing site-specific habitat projects
- Next steps/issues to be addressed

#### **PROCESS FOR FACILITATED WORK SESSIONS**

- Steering Committee members reaffirmed commitment to ground rules agreed to at the January 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. These include: strive for consensus, but some issues may require a vote; members can send substitutes.
- New ground rules agreed to on Feb. 10:
  - o Steering Committee members will respect the need to be able to discuss freely during the work sessions.
  - o Key decisions made and next steps will be written up by the Service Provider Team and circulated among Steering Committee members within 48 hours of the work session. This will be done instead of minutes or detailed work session notes.
  - o Recognizing that the issues being discussed at these work sessions are interrelated, the group agreed that policy decisions made at early work sessions may be revisited at later work sessions.
- At the end of the day, those attending felt that the facilitated work session was an effective way to work through the issues, and committed to additional sessions.
- It was agreed that the next work session will be March 10<sup>th</sup>, and the agenda will include discussion on land use actions.
- The Forum needs to be updated on draft plan progress, key decisions made by the Steering Committee, and potential controversial issues early in the process. We should not wait until draft plan submittal to bring these issues to the Forum.

#### **OVERARCHING QUESTION: HOW WILL THE CONSERVATION PLAN BE USED?**

**Question: Do you want to use the plan to negotiate with Shared Strategy and NOAA Fisheries (i.e., strive to meet the Shared Strategy Guidelines)?**

**Decision:**

- Plan development should be consistent with Shared Strategy guidance, to the extent that guidance is specified.
- However, while one goal of the WRIA 8 plan is delisting of chinook, the WRIA 8 Steering Committee Mission and Goals set the bar higher: "... to preserve, protect and restore habitat with the intent to recover listed species, including sustainable, genetically diverse, harvestable populations of naturally-spawning chinook salmon" in WRIA 8. We need to do what we need to support recovery of WRIA 8 salmon, regardless of whether Shared Strategy says our salmon are a priority.
- Throughout the work session, a number of new questions about the draft plan were prompted by the discussion of the key questions. A few of these questions are noted below; other questions will be brought to the Steering Committee at future work sessions.
  - o Can the draft plan be informally submitted to Shared Strategy upon completion?
  - o What information and analysis need to be included in the draft plan in order for it to be complete? When is the draft plan done enough?
  - o Shared Strategy is a driver for the draft plan schedule; what are other drivers for the plan schedule?
  - o Should the Technical Committee run the treatment phase of the EDT model as a means of evaluating how far actions will get them? If so, when and with what resources?

**Question: Do you want to use the plan to achieve quantifiable interim (e.g., 10- and 20-year) goals (e.g., habitat improvement, fish response, project implementation, other)?**

**Decision:**

- Yes, the plan should set measurable outcomes so that the public and NOAA can see progress.
- Multiple indicators will be needed, including measures of habitat change, fish response to habitat change, and fish population. Local stakeholders should be held accountable for habitat outcomes (where they have authority and some control), but it will be necessary to measure fish outcomes to know if the plan is succeeding and to gain public support.
- Specific ways to measure these outcomes (and who measures them over what time frame) are yet to be determined. The Technical Committee will need to recommend indicators.
- A related question that was not yet resolved is the time frame for plan actions and implementation (e.g., 5-10 years, 10-20, etc.).

**Question: Should the plan include specific commitments to actions and an implementation process?**

**Decision:**

- Yes, it has to have commitments and priorities.
- Longer term actions (such as those in the 10- to 20-year time frame) might not have commitments, but a process will be needed to identify them.
- There should be a defined process for regional coordination to continue to prioritize and implement actions over time, subject to resource availability. The process needs to include identifying regional priorities and those actions that should be implemented through regional collaboration.

**Question: Should the plan include a menu of possible actions to use as guidance, or a set of targeted, prioritized actions, or somewhere in-between (i.e., what level of detail on the actions)?**

**Decision:**

- The plan should be as specific as possible where there is scientific certainty to guide it. Specific actions should be identified and prioritized, particularly for the short term, using best available science and best available data.
- The desired outcome for an action should be specific. Where we know of more than one way to achieve the desired outcome, options should be provided to offer flexibility.
- Where available, examples and prescriptive checklists should be provided to help smaller jurisdictions in implementing land use and public outreach actions. The plan should provide sufficient level of detail about the actions to allow those jurisdictions without specialized staff to effectively implement the actions. However, it may be difficult to provide that specificity by June.
- To the extent possible, the plan should show benefits of taking an action and consequences of not taking an action.

**Question: Should the plan describe a framework for funding priority actions?**

**Decision:**

- Yes, it must have a funding framework that includes existing funding sources and new, sustainable funding sources that would provide more certainty. (This does not imply a need for an elaborate accounting system.)
- Specific funding mechanisms should be identified for specific actions or types of actions, when possible, and otherwise provide general guidance on funding sources.
- Non-monetary mechanisms such as awards and incentives (e.g., density credits, tax benefits) should also be included.
- It was agreed that there will be a need to fund some projects regionally (regional funding for regionally important projects).

**Question: Should there be continued regional collaboration during the implementation process to: implement regional priorities, track progress, evaluate actions, and/or make course adjustments?**

**Decision:** Clarification was made that “regional” could mean among WRIA 8 partners or between WRIA 8 partners and others. Collaboration will be necessary at both levels. First priority is for coordination among WRIA 8 partners, but acknowledge need to coordinate with others to secure funding. The preference is to keep WRIA 8 dollars funding WRIA 8 projects.

**SITE-SPECIFIC HABITAT PROJECTS:**

The Steering Committee consensus was that the process proposed by Jean White, WRIA 8 Early Actions Coordinator, to prioritize site-specific habitat projects was acceptable. The group accepted the draft qualitative criteria (technical criteria on benefits to chinook, and policy criteria on feasibility), and the use of the criteria to create short-term and long-term habitat project lists. The Steering Committee gave the following additional guidance:

- 1) Keep all of the projects on the list, so that the Steering Committee can see the whole list and how the criteria were applied to prioritize the list (i.e., keep the process transparent).
- 2) The Service Provider Team will work with the WRIA 8 Technical Committee to develop a proposal using the conservation strategy to rank reaches for site-specific habitat *protection* projects.
- 3) Members expressed a preference for integration of the different types of actions (site-specific projects, land use, and public outreach) into a unified package. Staff will develop a proposal for integration and clarify how each is being evaluated by similar criteria. Integrating actions into a single package should help alleviate the concern that only site-specific habitat projects get considered for funding.

## **NEXT STEPS/ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED:**

- At the February 26<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee meeting, we will review decisions for those Steering Committee members who were not present at the February 10th work session. The committee will also discuss whether the approach is working and whether it is realistic to hold one or two work sessions in March.
- March 10 is the next scheduled work session. The Steering Committee also has an option to hold a work session on March 24<sup>th</sup>.
- A number of issues and questions were raised during the work session. While a few of these were included in the notes above, many others were raised. The Service Provider Team will bring these back to the Steering Committee at future work sessions.

---

## **Key Decisions from WRIA 8 Steering Committee Work Session #2 March 10, 2004**

**Decisions/Informational Items are listed for the following topics. Decision items are shown as Decision.**

- Forum update
- Science conservation strategy
- Relation of science to policy (decision items)
- Land use actions (decision items)
- Integration of types of actions (decision items)
- Next steps/issues to be addressed

## **FORUM UPDATE**

- Jane Lamensdorf-Bucher, the WRIA 8 Watershed Coordinator, reviewed what was discussed with the WRIA 8 Forum. A parallel process cannot be done (insufficient time, insufficient staff resources, creates an unending tape loop). The process described in the interlocal agreement will be used, i.e., the Steering Committee will continue to develop the plan that will then be presented to the Forum. However, the Service Provider Team will begin providing information to the Forum such as highlights of the science conservation strategy and of the recommendations for land use so that the Forum can start to become familiar with the draft plan. There are also numerous opportunities for local government involvement in the development of the plan, including through working committees, participation on the Steering Committee, and during the public review process.
- The Forum gave permission for the draft plan to be informally submitted to Shared Strategy as long as the plan is clearly noted to be a draft that has not gone through either public review or review by the Forum and city and county councils. The informal submission to Shared Strategy is expected to provide a reading on what federal agencies are looking for.
- **REPORT BACK ON OTHER ITEMS:** A refined proposal will be available later next week to address the concerns about the EDT gaps in rating protection projects. It will be shared with Steering Committee members Joan Burlingame and Michelle Connor at a minimum. If you would also like to see the details, please contact Jean White, WRIA 8 Early Actions Projects Coordinator.

## **SCIENCE CONSERVATION STRATEGY**

- Genetics study and related analysis will be undertaken to better determine how many independent populations exist in WRIA 8. Results are expected in the fall.
- **Please send comments or questions on the Science Foundation and the WRIA 8 Conservation Strategy (Chapters 4 and 5 of the Draft Plan Framework notebook) to Brian Murray, WRIA 8 Technical Committee Staff Support (King County staff).**

## RELATION OF SCIENCE TO POLICY

- To deal with difficult political issues, the process needs to be transparent, the rationale for decisions and trade-offs clearly shown.
- **Decision**: The Actions chapter will include protection and restoration projects for the Issaquah population, but state that more scientific data is being collected and analyzed to ensure better understanding of level of risk before the restoration projects will be prioritized.
- **Decision**: Need to prioritize actions; geographic distribution of some kinds of projects will be important.
- **Decision**: Tier 2 projects may sometimes be used ahead of Tier 1 projects depending on criteria beyond benefits to chinook – e.g., community support, geographic distribution, feasibility.

## LAND USE

- **Decision**: Yes, Steering Committee members want land use actions included in the plan. While the recommendations for specific actions in Tier 1 and 2 subareas should not be required, the risk to the resource of not implementing them should be shown. Jurisdictions should be invited to propose creative alternative actions that can also meet stated outcomes.
- **Decision**: Use the two-pronged approach, which offers specific recommendations for Tier 1 and Tier 2 subareas and a menu of land use tools that jurisdictions can implement.
- Tier 1 land use actions, including recommendations for migratory corridors, nearshore, and Issaquah, will be included in the June 30<sup>th</sup> draft, with a note that Tier 2 actions will be included in the full plan.
- **Decision**: Following discussion of the practicality of incorporating WRIA 8 science during comprehensive plan updates by 12/04, it was decided that the specific dates (12/04) should be deleted and replaced by more general language, e.g., “Jurisdictions should use WRIA 8 science during future comprehensive plan revisions, timing to be determined by individual jurisdictions.”
- Other specific clarifications and additions were noted and will be made by the Service Provider Team in the next edition of the draft. **Please send any further comments or questions on land use actions to Sally King, WRIA 8 Land Use Coordinator.**

## INTEGRATION OF ACTIONS

- **Decision**: Yes, the proposed method of integrating the various types of actions (land use, site-specific protection and restoration projects, and public outreach) is a useful tool.
- **Decision**: Use less technical language in the integration matrix (as shown in the example).
- **Decision**: Consider incorporating possible funding sources to the extent possible.
- **Decision**: If possible, include processes in place to implement actions.

## NEXT STEPS/ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED:

- April 14<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> are the next scheduled work sessions.
  - On April 14<sup>th</sup>, the expected topics are part of implementation through adaptive management, specifically measures and organization (Chapters 7 and 8 of the Draft Plan Framework notebook). In addition, a proposal will be made on how we can address the Shared Strategy questions by June 30<sup>th</sup>.
  - On April 28<sup>th</sup>, the implementation discussion will continue and will include the topic of funding (Chapter 9 of the Draft Plan Framework notebook). In addition, we will discuss the public review proposal for the plan.
- A number of issues, questions, and suggestions were raised during the work session. The Service Provider Team will bring these back to the Steering Committee at future work sessions. (Some may require additional time and resources to follow through on.)

---

## Key Decisions from WRIA 8 Steering Committee Work Session #3 April 14, 2004

Decisions/Informational Items are listed for the following topics. Decision items are shown as **Decision**.

- How to note consensus decisions (head-nod)
- Context for today's discussion
- Monitoring, measures, and goals (decisions)
- June 30<sup>th</sup> work product and beyond
- Examples of other watershed implementation efforts
- Next steps/issues to be addressed

### HOW TO NOTE CONSENSUS DECISIONS

- The facilitator proposed that the language for each decision be reviewed and verified by the Steering Committee on the spot so that agreement on decisions will be clearer. Steering Committee members nodded in approval of this modification to the ground rules.

### CONTEXT FOR TODAY'S DISCUSSION

- Adaptive management is the framework for implementation of the plan and consists of four interwoven topics – monitoring, measures, and goals; organization and decisionmaking structure; funding; and commitments – that will be addressed today and at the next two work sessions.

### MONITORING, MEASURES, AND GOALS

1. **Question:** *What should be emphasized for evaluating success?*

**Response:** The Steering Committee was polled regarding which of the already established plan goals they want to focus on to measure and monitor success of the plan.

- Increased chinook and bull trout populations – 8 high, 5 medium, 2 low
- **Increased salmonid use of habitat** – 12 high, 2 medium, 0 low
- **Improved and restored aquatic habitat** – 14 high, 2 medium, 0 low
- Increased populations of other salmonids – 0 high, 11 medium, 3 low
- Improved regional actions for fish – 6 high, 8 medium, 1 low

2. **Question:** *What is sufficient progress to achieve through this plan?*

**Decision:** For the mid-term goal of increased chinook populations, use these objectives:

- Reduce risk of extinction
- Productivity of Cedar and North Lake Washington chinook populations is lambda, i.e., greater than or equal to 1 (one spawner produces one spawner in the next generation)
- Conserve genetic diversity
- **Caveat:** will need to define "mid-term".

**Decision:** For the goal of increased salmonid use of habitat, use these objectives:

- Increased use of spawning habitat (not location specific)
- Increased spawning habitat areas, i.e., increase existing areas and provide new areas (not location specific)
- Cedar – greater number of reaches used for spawning
- NLW – core areas spawning reaches maintained and satellite area shows improvement to consistent annual chinook use of spawning areas

- Increased percentage of late vs early migrant juvenile chinook on Cedar River (for life history diversity)
- Juvenile survival through lakes and migratory areas is improved. Clarify that migratory includes Lakes Washington and Sammamish, Sammamish River, Ship Canal and Locks, and Puget Sound Nearshore.

**Decision:** For the goal of improved and restored aquatic habitat, use these objectives:

- No further degradation of habitat is a net goal for WRIA 8. The preference is for improvement of aquatic habitat, but no further degradation would be a minimum standard.
- Set goals for improved riparian condition, forest cover, large woody debris, etc. (could vary by sub-basin)

**Decision:** For the goal of improved regional actions for fish, use these objectives:

- Increased number of actions taken
- Increased number of regional projects
- Increased funding spent
- Increased number of people involved in programs
- **Caveat:** will need to define “regional projects”

3. **Question:** *What will we measure to show progress?*

**Decisions** for Implementation Monitoring (“Are we doing what we said we’d do?”)

- Appropriate staff will work together to develop recommendations on how to track and measure land use actions taken, taking into account changes to regulations driven by desire to protect salmon. This exercise should recognize and acknowledge that many protective regulations and other protective land use programs are already in place.
- Implementation measures for other types of actions were not explicitly discussed.

**Decisions** for Direct Effectiveness Monitoring (“Does the action do what we thought it would?”)

- **Habitat Projects:**
  - Audit/sample/spot check projects with relatively certain outcomes.
  - Link to and learn from other processes where monitoring is being developed for projects with uncertain outcomes.
  - Monitor where most uncertainty or in uncertain environments, which mean higher risk.
- **Education Actions:**
  - Measurement of education is important.
  - Monitoring methods should be cost-effective. (Possible techniques to measure were discussed and suggestions included market trends, surveys, observing behavioral changes, and others.)
  - Use what is measured through other means and for other purposes where possible. Suggestions included drawing correlations to types of permits applied for, types of citations issued, TMDLs, and other means.
- **Land Use Actions:**
  - Monitor by jurisdiction the percent change in riparian conditions, the percent change in forest cover, and the percent change in impervious surface compared to percent change anticipated by growth projections.
  - Conduct this monitoring cost-effectively by jurisdiction.



**Decisions for Cumulative Effectiveness Monitoring** (“Are things improving?”)

- Monitor beyond just projects.
- To determine trend in basin, include also non-project actions and predation.

**Decisions for Validation Monitoring** (“Are chinook populations getting healthier?”)

- Adaptive Management Work Group, WRIA 8 Technical Committee, and the Service Provider Team will work together to develop a proposal to answer this question.

**Decisions for Overall Level of Effort on Monitoring**

- Figure out total costs, cut back as necessary based on priorities.
- Cumulative effectiveness is key.
- For June 30<sup>th</sup> Tier 1 draft, focus on developing a proposal to conduct cumulative effectiveness monitoring and some direct effectiveness monitoring as well as collaborating to identify data gaps.
- Link direct effectiveness of projects to cumulative effectiveness.

4. **Question:** *When will we assess progress and evaluate needs for adjusting actions?*

Appropriate staff will work together to develop a proposal to answer this question.

5. **Question:** *How should we collect and manage information?*

Appropriate staff will work together to develop a proposal to answer this question.

**Parking lot:** When will we address other species and do we need to add an additional goal to avoid future listings?

**JUNE 30<sup>TH</sup> WORK PRODUCT AND BEYOND**

This topic was for discussion today and will be brought back at the April 28<sup>th</sup> work session for a decision. The Steering Committee expressed an initial preference for the following two options:

- **Option B** -- Final Phase I plan contains prioritized actions list for Tier 1 AND non-prioritized list of actions for Tiers 2 and 3 (i.e., use Near-Term Action Agenda for the interim). No site-specific actions for Tier 3. Prioritization for Tier 2 will be added in the next phase.
- **Option D** -- Final Phase I plan contains prioritized actions list for Tiers 1 and 2. No site-specific actions for Tier 3.
- The Steering Committee also expressed a preference for submitting the final Steering Committee proposed draft plan to the WRIA 8 Forum in January 2005 (meaning the formal 90-day clock for Forum review and approval or remand would start in January).

The Conservation Plan Manager will develop schedules and tasks for these options and present them for Steering Committee decision on April 28<sup>th</sup>. These proposals will look at what schedule and resources will be necessary and what level of detail is realistic in order to complete these two options.

**EXAMPLES OF OTHER WATERSHED IMPLEMENTATION EFFORTS**

- There was a presentation on watershed efforts around the country that have made the transition from planning to implementation. In particular, the presentation looked at how other similar efforts have organized and sought funding.

**NEXT STEPS/ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED:**

- April 28<sup>th</sup> and May 27<sup>th</sup> are the next scheduled work sessions.

- On April 28<sup>th</sup>, the implementation discussion will continue and will cover the topics of organization (Chapter 8 of the Draft Plan Framework notebook) and funding (Chapter 9). In addition, the Steering Committee will approve the schedule to finalize the draft plan for formal submittal to the WRIA 8 Forum.
- On May 27<sup>th</sup>, the implementation discussion will finish with the topic of commitments (Chapter 10). The Steering Committee will also review and rank recommendations for project proposals to be submitted to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.
- A number of issues, questions, and suggestions were raised during the work session. The Service Provider Team will bring these back to the Steering Committee at future work sessions. (Some may require additional time and resources to follow through on.)

---

### Key Decisions from WRIA 8 Steering Committee Work Session #4 April 28, 2004

**Decisions/Informational items are listed for the following topics. Decision items are shown as Decision.**

- Getting to the final draft plan (decisions)
- Organizational and decisionmaking framework for plan implementation (decisions)
- Funding strategy for plan implementation

#### **GETTING TO THE FINAL DRAFT PLAN**

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved the “Plan Manager Option” for the schedule to complete the final draft plan. Under this schedule, the plan will be delivered to the WRIA 8 Forum in late February 2005. Public review will occur in fall 2004. ***See attached for the approved schedule and resource assumptions.***
- The Steering Committee discussed the importance of informing the public, local jurisdictions, and interested groups about the issues and the plan. The service provider team and the Public Outreach Committee will develop a communications plan to present to the Steering Committee.
- The discussion on cost estimates was postponed until the May 27<sup>th</sup> work session, when it will be part of the discussion on commitments.
- Steering Committee members expressed interest in hearing more about what it would mean to conduct the “treatment” phase of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment model. This will be provided at a later date.

#### **ORGANIZATIONAL AND DECISIONMAKING FRAMEWORK FOR PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

The following six questions were responded to through a discussion of seven functions necessary to implement the plan. Note: the WRIA 8 Service Provider Team left during this part of the work session so that committee members could feel free to offer ideas that differed from current organization.

1. How should we accomplish the different functions that are critical to successful plan implementation?
2. Which should be accomplished through regional collaboration, and which should be accomplished by separate plan implementers?
3. What type and level of organizational structure is necessary to achieve regional collaboration where you’ve indicated you want it?

4. Should there be an oversight body or bodies? If so, who should participate? How should the work of this body or bodies be coordinated?
5. Is there a need for shared technical resources? Should there be a technical committee?
6. Do the functions that need to be accomplished suggest a need for staff support? If so, how should that staff support be provided?

The Steering Committee discussed the following seven functions in order to answer the preceding questions. For each function, three options were provided that ranged along a spectrum from separate individual jurisdictional responsibility to collective regional actions.

- **Function #1: Tracking and Guiding Plan Implementation (Collecting and sharing information about completion of plan actions) – Decision:** The third option best approximates what the Steering Committee determined will be needed to ensure successful implementation of the plan. The third option calls for “. . . a defined process for tracking implementation (e.g., agreed-upon measures and a commitment to gather the data). Information is to be shared (e.g., on a web site). An oversight body is to meet on some schedule (annually?) to discuss implementation progress. Information on implementation is to be synthesized to support discussion among members of the oversight body.”
- **Function #2: Making Technical Assessments about Effectiveness (Compiling and analyzing information describing the results of actions) – Decision:** The third option best approximates what the Steering Committee determined will be needed to ensure successful implementation of the plan. The third option calls for “. . . WRIA partners [to] work together to select and prioritize measures. Each WRIA partner is responsible for managing data collection, but agreed-upon guidelines ensure data can be compared. There is a defined process for ‘rolling up’ the data at the WRIA level. Some of the highest priority monitoring is funded and managed by the WRIA. For that, the information could be collected by WRIA staff, a federal agency, a university or consultant. Potential role for a technical committee.”
- **Function #3: Evaluating Progress and Making Decisions About Priorities (Receiving technical findings and using them to decide to maintain current strategy or make changes to the strategy and its priorities) – Decision:** The third option best approximates what the Steering Committee determined will be needed to ensure successful implementation of the plan. The third option calls for “. . . formal evaluation and review of the plan, [including] performance measures and a predictable and pre-determined review process for trends and possible strategy shifts.”
- **Function #4: Communicating Progress (Developing messages and information to describe effectiveness and progress toward goals/mission and share with funders/citizens/regulators) – Decision:** The third option best approximates what the Steering Committee determined will be needed to ensure successful implementation of the plan. The third option calls for “a regional communication strategy [to be developed through] . . . a WRIA-level process, [regional] support for . . . shared messages about progress . . . [implementing] plan actions, and shared communication tools (press releases, web page, etc.). Information is to be made available to partners and interested parties through brief reports at acceptable intervals.”
- **Function #5: Managing Data that Describes Plan Effectiveness and Progress (Establish technical standards, identify roles and responsibilities, and build/maintain capacity and tools for sharing data) – Decision:** A hybrid of the

second and third options best approximates what the Steering Committee determined will be needed to ensure successful implementation of the plan. “WRIA partners adopt common protocols for data sharing. [There is a] possible technical committee role in setting technical standards. Data [can be] shared per [common] protocols via accepted tools (e.g., links to web pages) and venues (e.g., conferences).” A data clearinghouse for ease of access and analysis may be desirable, depending on costs, feasibility, and monitoring strategy. Such a clearinghouse would be used to store “data essential for keeping the Ecosystem Data and Treatment (EDT) habitat model and other tools current. The clearinghouse could be managed by shared staff, jurisdiction, consultant, or [other entity], including a possible role for a technical committee.”

- **Function #6: Implementing Habitat Actions (Marshalling the capacity to implement plan actions, including site-specific projects, public outreach and land use actions) – Decision:** A hybrid of all three options best approximates what the Steering Committee determined will be needed to ensure successful implementation of the plan. “Actions are carried out separately by stakeholders and/or by local jurisdictions [where] the actions [occur]. [In addition,] WRIA partners [can] develop partnerships on an *ad hoc* basis where collaboration will aid implementation (e.g., a joint pesticide education campaign, an annual workshop to exchange lessons learned from levee setback projects, etc.). Regional programs [may be considered] to support action implementation (e.g., WRIA basin stewards, a project SWAT team to aid jurisdictions with project design or construction, or regional training on various land use management tools such as transferable development rights).” However, further discussion is needed to determine which specific programmatic actions should be a basis for collaboration.
- **Function #7: Securing Funds to Support Plan Implementation Functions (Identify, maintain, increase, and/or pursue funding for high priority actions) – Decision:** A hybrid of all three options best approximates what the Steering Committee determined will be needed to ensure successful implementation of the plan. “WRIA partners individually raise funds to complete [their respective] high priority actions (capital improvement projects, research, outreach, regulations, etc.) [WRIA] partners agree to ongoing prioritization of actions for the watershed and for specified funding sources. Partners [are] kept informed about funding opportunities by a shared communication tool (e.g., web page, newsletter) [WRIA] partners collaborate to identify and pursue funding for plan implementation. Shared activities could include 1) fostering relationships with funders, 2) aggressively pursuing funding for high priority actions, or 3) organizing WRIA-scale lobbying.”

## **FUNDING STRATEGY FOR PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

Specific decisions were not sought in the discussion on funding. Rather, the Steering Committee provided direction for the funding strategy being developed for the June 30<sup>th</sup> draft that will be further refined at future work sessions of the Steering Committee.

1. **Questions:** How much money would you like to try to raise and spend on recovery actions? Is the current level too high, too low, or about right?  
**Response Summary:** This cannot be resolved in isolation, but involves a give-and-take between the expected biological outcomes and the costs of actions. The Steering Committee is comfortable with the current level of spending or a little more, but not less. The amount to ramp up will depend on the benefits achieved. We will need to better prioritize actions and to work even more effectively with the amounts we have.
2. **Questions:** Who should provide the funding? Are state and federal levels too low or about right? Is the amount from regional sources too much, too little, or about right?

**Response Summary:** It would be good to raise the funding coming from the federal and state governments, but twice the current level is difficult to expect. We need to consider that other states may be more successful at receiving federal funds because they are able to show multiple needs; in addition, in many cases, habitat conditions may be more severely degraded than in Washington state. When Congress receives the Shared Strategy recovery plan, it may be a good opportunity to lobby more actively for funds from the federal and state governments. While it may prove difficult to lobby for more money for the Salmon Recovery Funding Board, there is other federal funding available, particularly for one-time capital expenditures, that we need to pursue.

The current amount from regional and local sources are appropriate to continue. The King Conservation District fee needs to be renewed and there may be opportunities to work with the KCD board and the state to increase the per-parcel fee. We also need to remember non-monetary tools such as transferable development rights.

3. **Questions:** When will the funding be needed? Steady stream or front-loading?

**Response Summary:** The Steering Committee preferred a steady stream of funding. Educational and marketing efforts are needed to sustain public and political interest over the long term.

#### **NEXT STEPS/ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED**

The next scheduled work sessions are May 27<sup>th</sup>, July 28<sup>th</sup>, September 22<sup>nd</sup>, and October 6<sup>th</sup>.

- On **May 27<sup>th</sup>**, the implementation discussion will finish with the topic of commitments (Chapter 10). The Steering Committee will also review and rank recommendations for project proposals to be submitted to the Salmon Recovery Funding Board.
- On **July 28<sup>th</sup>**, the Steering Committee will review Tier 1 actions, prioritization framework, and integration/tradeoff analysis.
- On **September 22<sup>nd</sup>** and **October 6<sup>th</sup>**, the Steering Committee will review and approve actions lists and new analyses; review input from the NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team; and finalize implementation (adaptive management) framework.
- Per request of some Steering Committee members, at a future meeting or work session there will be a discussion on how the Treatment phase of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment model (EDT) can be used to support Steering Committee decision-making about alternatives, and the resources and time that will be necessary to complete this phase.
- There will be an opportunity at a future meeting to hear about recommendations for harvest and hatcheries from the co-managers.
- A number of issues, questions, and suggestions were raised during the work session. The Service Provider Team will bring these back to the Steering Committee at future work sessions. (Some may require additional time and resources to follow through on.)

---

#### **Key Decisions from WRIA 8 Steering Committee Work Session #5 May 27, 2004**

**Decisions/Informational items are listed for the following topics. Decision items are shown as Decision.** Other items were points to consider from Steering Committee members.

- Implementation timeline (decisions)
- Commitments and benefits for implementing the plan (decisions)
- Recommendations for the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (decisions)

## IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

The following six questions were responded to through a series of proposals that are noted by corresponding decisions below.

1. **What is the plan implementation horizon?**
2. **When will we check on efforts to implement the plan?**
3. **When will we begin to formally assess plan effectiveness?**
4. **When will plan progress and priorities be evaluated?**
5. **When will leaders convene to review plan status?**
6. **When does the plan implementation clock start ticking?** Three options:
  - When Steering Committee approves the plan
  - When Forum approves and transmits the plan to local jurisdictions
  - When a critical mass of jurisdictions ratifies the plan as per the interlocal agreement

1. **Decision: The Steering Committee approved a 10-year horizon for plan implementation.**
  - There are multiple relevant processes, particularly on water quality and water quantity, that we may want to link to. One example is the water resource planning process described in HB 1338.
  - Determining which of these to link to and how formally or directly is a choice decision-makers can make in the future, considering available resources.
  - Although every jurisdiction differs, generally speaking capital improvement project (CIP) lists can be influenced more frequently than every six years as those lists are usually revised on a two-year basis that is linked to budgeting. CIP bonds are usually passed/issued on a longer (e.g., 20-year) timeframe.
  - Monitoring should not be limited to the year class that spawns immediately after plan implementation starts because that would provide only two life cycles in ten years. To have more data to compare, the four year classes that exist over the ten years should be tracked.
2. **Decision: The Steering Committee approved annual formal reporting of implementation progress.** (Implementation monitoring measures whether implementers are doing what they said they would.)
  - It is important to communicate progress to the public.
  - The breadth and depth of the annual report will need to be determined and will depend on available resources.
  - Formal annual reporting can be supplemented by informal sharing more frequently among implementers.
  - It may be appropriate to develop a countywide planning policy on benchmarking plan implementation, so that progress would be included in the growth management annual benchmark report.
3. **Decision: The Steering Committee approved that direct effectiveness be assessed starting in year 3 of plan implementation and be done every three years.** (Direct effectiveness monitoring measures whether actions are doing what was expected.)
  - Effectiveness data should be collected annually but reports on findings should be made when sufficient analysis can be done to draw conclusions, such as every 3 to 5 years.

- It is unrealistic and not cost-effective to make and implement major changes in priorities more frequently than every several years.
  - However, there needs to be some mechanism to raise a red flag if habitat is being lost or actions are proving to not be effective in improving habitat.
  - We need to communicate to public that it will take more than 10 years to see increased salmon runs and that change will be incremental. But we need to reassure the public that will make improvements if necessary.
4. **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved that plan priorities and results will be evaluated in year 5 of plan implementation.
- Consider expanding the annual report in appropriate years to accommodate cumulative effectiveness information. (Cumulative effectiveness monitoring measures whether things are improving.)
5. **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved that an oversight body will convene at least annually and that a “summit” body will convene less frequently to review plan status.
- The membership of these bodies is to be determined. Overlapping membership is a good idea, similar to the current overlap between Steering Committee and Forum.
  - The groups should meet frequently enough to maintain knowledge and familiarity with the process.
  - There needs to be a function to communicate to and educate the public to evolve towards a culture whose actions support salmon recovery (similar to the evolution in behavior on recycling).
  - If monitoring shows the need for course corrections, the oversight body would review and provide guidance. The oversight body would also link to the summit group (decisionmakers) on changes.
  - Oversight and “summit” bodies can meet more frequently, if needed, on other issues such as organization and operations.
  - Convening and maintaining these groups will require staff resources and operations dollars.
6. **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved starting the implementation clock when a critical mass of local jurisdictions has ratified the plan. (Note: The interlocal agreement defines ratification as “by at least nine jurisdictions within WRIA 8 representing at least seventy percent (70%) of the total population of WRIA 8.”)
- Starting the implementation clock means when to initiate the reporting and evaluation cycle.
  - The baseline for monitoring can start earlier. The massive amount of data that was collected from reports and experts to build the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment model could be used as the baseline for monitoring and reporting.
  - Implementation of actions can start sooner than ratification by the critical mass.
  - Implementation of actions is already under way through the Near-Term Action Agenda.

## **COMMITMENTS AND BENEFITS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN**

The Steering Committee discussed four questions. Where decisions were made, these are expressly noted. Other items are points to consider as the issue paper from the Draft Plan Framework is developed into a proposal for the June 30<sup>th</sup> work product. Commitment is a topic that will need to be revisited once the full slate of recommended actions is available. The WRIA 8 Forum and local jurisdictions will need to weigh in as well. Decisions on this topic will evolve through an iterative process.

## **1. What benefits do implementers want?**

- \* Healthy salmon populations and habitat
- \* Ecosystem health, including species diversity, maintenance of native species, and water quality
- \* Legacy for future generations, including commercial, tribal, and sport fishing; quality of life, including cultural heritage
- Options preserved for the future
- Change in culture, behavior, and thinking – a paradigm shift
- Funding and assistance
- Cleaner, colder water
- Common priorities
- Assurances for meeting various federal and state laws and requirements beyond the Endangered Species Act, such as the Clean Water Act, the Growth Management Act, NPDES permits
- Regional cooperation and success on a difficult issue
- Managing growth effectively
- Public ownership of the problem/Holding ourselves and others accountable
- Efficient use of resources and investments
- Certainty and predictability for jurisdictions, private sector, and the public
- Streamlined permitting
- Distributed responsibility
- Shared science
- Public access
- An informal poll found that the most important benefits to Steering Committee members were healthy salmon populations and habitat, ecosystem health, and legacy for future generations/quality of life.
- The following also received recognition in the informal straw poll, although fewer votes: options preserved for the future; cultural heritage (part of legacy/quality of life); change in culture/behavior/ thinking; funding/assistance; cleaner, colder water; common priorities; federal and state assurances; and regional cooperation/success.
- Shared Strategy will need to acknowledge that the federal government needs to provide some sort of assurances in exchange for implementation of the plan.
- Assurances and grants may be appropriate through other federal and state laws and programs in return for commitments to implement the conservation plan, e.g., under the Clean Water Act and through NPDES stormwater permits.

## **2. What Endangered Species Act assurances do implementers expect?**

- The Steering Committee does not expect to execute an Incidental Take Permit (Section 10 of ESA) that would require a formal contract with the federal government for specific actions spelled out in a Habitat Conservation Plan.
- However, the federal government should reward commitments from local jurisdictions to implement the conservation plan through incentives such as moving implementers to the head of the permitting line on plan actions and more timely responses from permitting agencies for review of plan actions.
- Implementers should tell Shared Strategy what they expect in return for their commitments, i.e., take the first step and not wait for the federal government to make an offer.
- If local jurisdictions commit to implementing the conservation plan, then the federal government should endorse the plan actions and stand with the local jurisdictions should there be legal challenges.
- The federal government needs to endorse the science that is the foundation of the plan.



### 3. What type/level of commitments are appropriate?

- Five options along a continuum of level of commitments were presented. The first two options at the low end of the continuum (no formal commitments and coordinated regional process) were considered to be insufficient.
- Either of the last two options along the continuum -- local government councils commit to implement particular actions or ratify/adopt the entire plan -- were favored.
- The middle option of local government councils passing resolutions to formally consider the plan as guidance was seen as a minimum commitment to participate.
- The more assurances desired from the federal government, the more stringent the commitment will need to be.
- The more stringent commitments implementers are willing to make, the more benefits and rewards they should accrue.

### 4. What accountability will implementers have?

- Carrots should be used rather than sticks. Implementers will report progress, those who choose not to implement will not have progress to report.
- Funding should still be available for implementation of plan actions to those who do not formally commit. However, perhaps they may lose some points.

The Steering Committee posed an additional question: **What types of commitments can entities and organizations besides local governments contribute to this effort?**

- There need to be mechanisms for non-governmental entities to sign on.
- Examples could include public-private partnerships, funding and assistance from foundations, plan endorsement at public review sessions, helping in public outreach, providing political support.
- Junior taxing districts need to be in compliance with local governments, so water and sewer districts will come on board through contract relationships with utilities.
- State agencies may be able to provide grants through related programs, e.g., grants for improving water quality.

### RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

- A report was provided on the status of previously approved projects. Please contact Jean White, Early Action Projects Coordinator, at 206-296-1479, if you would like a copy.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved the ranking recommended by the Project Subcommittee. For a report on the ranked projects, please contact Jean White, Early Action Projects Coordinator, at 206-296-1479.
- In addition, Steering Committee members requested that the following points be noted:
  - All the proposed projects were deemed to be worthy of funding and the announcement of the rankings should state that.
  - Jurisdictions/sponsors should not be penalized for supplying a large match.
  - Benefit to salmon should be higher criteria than cost.
  - Redmond should be encouraged to pursue the Bear Creek project with the Corps even though the project did not rank number one.
  - Linda Smith from the Corps agreed to convene a meeting of Steering Committee members (Frank Urabeck, Terry Lavender, Geoff Clayton) who said they would offer support to Redmond if that would help get the project fully funded and implemented.
  - Bob Everitt from WA Department of Fish and Wildlife noted that proponents should consider submitting projects to the urban wildlife habitat section of the state's Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program because there are often not enough good proposals.

## NEXT STEPS/ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

- There will be a regular 2-hour meeting of the Steering Committee on **June 24<sup>th</sup>** at which the co-managers will discuss recommendations for harvest and hatchery management and a representative from U.S. Fish and Wildlife will discuss expectations for bull trout, the other listed fish in WRIA 8.
- The next scheduled work sessions are July 28<sup>th</sup>, September 22<sup>nd</sup>, and October 6<sup>th</sup>.
- On **July 28<sup>th</sup>**, the Steering Committee will review the communications/marketing strategy, Tier 1 actions, prioritization framework, and integration/tradeoff analysis.
- On **September 22<sup>nd</sup>** and **October 6<sup>th</sup>**, the Steering Committee will review and approve actions lists and new analyses; review input from the NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team; and finalize implementation (adaptive management) framework.
- A number of issues, questions, and suggestions were raised during the work session. The Service Provider Team will bring these back to the Steering Committee at future work sessions. (Some may require additional time and resources to follow through on.)

---

### Key Decisions from WRIA 8 Steering Committee Work Session #6 July 28, 2004

**Decisions/Informational items are listed for the following topics. Decision items are shown as Decision.** Other items were points to consider from Steering Committee members.

- Action recommendations (decisions)
- Marketing plan and public review (decisions)
- Public comment
- Updates

## ACTION RECOMMENDATIONS

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved the creation of an integrated start list of approximately 50 actions for each of the three Chinook populations. Land use, site-specific habitat protection and restoration projects, and public outreach will be integrated into a single strategic start list to focus watershed priorities. Actions for the nearshore and migratory corridors will be included as part of the start list.
- The integrated start list could serve multiple purposes. It could provide a manageable context for future discussions on regional collaboration, funding sources, regional versus local implementation, and ratification (i.e., what are we asking local governments to ratify?). The start list could also offer interim guidance to implementers until more information is available to increase certainty of benefits of proposed actions to Chinook. In addition, the start list could provide a manageable list for public and Forum review as well as for developing cost estimates, starting up the monitoring program, sharing resources for any collaborative organizational structure, and evaluating actions in the Treatment phase of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment model. The Steering Committee may want to revisit the purpose of the start list through discussions on funding, commitments, or other related topics at future work sessions.
- Actions recommended on the start list are based on the science conservation strategy but have not undergone technical review. The start list comes out of the comprehensive lists for each action type and subarea that have been developed collaboratively with area experts and stakeholders. The intent is to include the highest priority actions on the start list, but the driver is to have a manageable number.

- Beyond being included on the start list, actions will not be further ranked for each population, across populations, by type of action, nor across types of action.
- While the Service Provider Team proposed a rough division of 25 site-specific habitat projects to 12-13 each of land use and public outreach actions per population, **the Steering Committee directed that the specific needs of each population and area should drive the mix of actions.** The service provider team will document the rationale used to develop the actions on the start list.
- **Decision:** The start list needs to include actions at the landscape scale as well as the reach scale to ensure geographic equity and opportunities for implementation by all jurisdictions.
- Actions that are high priority but challenging to implement need to be included as well as high priority actions that are easier to implement or ready to go.
- **The Steering Committee will be able to review the start list before it goes out to the public for review as part of the draft plan.**
- **Decision:** Up to five actions may be added to the start list through the public review process. Recommendations will be brought back to the Steering Committee to consider.
- **Decision:** The separate comprehensive lists of land use, site-specific habitat protection and restoration projects, and public outreach actions for Tier 1 subareas and migratory corridors will remain in the plan, and comprehensive lists for Tier 2 subareas will be added. Watershed-wide or basinwide land use and public outreach actions will address Tier 3 subareas.
- For the public review draft, there will be no site-specific habitat projects in Tier 3 subareas, although the Steering Committee and the Forum could decide to address these in the future by directing development of actions for coho and kokanee.
- Within each comprehensive list, actions have been or will be prioritized or evaluated through a collaborative process of area experts and stakeholders using qualitative criteria based on the science conservation strategy and other factors such as feasibility/ implementability and community/local support. These factors vary somewhat according to the type of action.
- **Comprehensive lists for Tier 1 subareas, migratory corridors, and nearshore are in the June 30<sup>th</sup> Work Product that all Steering Committee members received. Comprehensive lists for Tier 2 subareas will be emailed to Steering Committee members for review prior to the next work session on September 22<sup>nd</sup>.**
- **Decision:** Following a presentation on how the Treatment phase of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment model could be used to help evaluate the effectiveness of conservation actions, **the Steering Committee approved the request for the WRIA 8 Technical Committee to begin lining up resources that would start the Treatment phase in 2005 of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment model.** The T phase will allow alternative suites of actions to be compared on a relative scale. The Technical Committee expects to submit a King Conservation District grant application for this work. WA Department of Fish and Wildlife has also offered some staff support. In addition, the continued availability of Technical Committee members will be critical.
- The start list and the comprehensive lists could be modified based on the results of the Treatment evaluation through an adaptive management process. Development of these lists, particularly the start list, is to be an iterative process.
- **Decision:** **Cost estimates will be done only for actions on the integrated start list.** Where readily available, cost estimates will be included for actions on the comprehensive lists. Costs for land use actions will be difficult to estimate; the method developed by Evergreen Consultants for Shared Strategy will most likely be used.
- **Decision:** Referring to the integrated map graphic for the North Lake Washington population that is in the June 30<sup>th</sup> Work Product, **the Steering Committee directed that**

**similar integrated map graphics be developed for the other two Chinook populations and for the migratory corridors (total 4 maps).** It was recommended that the language be less “jargon-y” and simplified for electeds and the public.

- **Decision:** Referring to the matrix summary of all actions proposed for the North Lake Washington tributaries subarea, **the Steering Committee approved the development of similar summary lists for the other two Chinook populations and the migratory corridors.** The matrix columns may not be needed, but the summarized list of all actions by population is requested.

## **MARKETING PLAN AND PUBLIC REVIEW**

- **Decision:** Following a brief review of public involvement in the conservation planning process to date, **the Steering Committee reviewed and approved the proposed Marketing Plan for Public Involvement in the Chinook Conservation Plan.**
- There are two phases to the Marketing Plan. Phase 1 addresses the need to regenerate interest in salmon. Phase 2 will advertise plan release and means to review and comment. The two phases are not necessarily consecutive – some actions may be concurrent and overlap.
- **As a baseline, the following deliverables can be expected:**
  - The key messages will be refined to reflect the science conservation strategy and draft plan and brought to the Steering Committee for review on September 22<sup>nd</sup>.
  - Press releases and brief articles will be written for distribution to the media and newsletters of interested groups.
  - A plan summary will be created to help the public and electeds understand the key messages and main points of the plan. The summary (or highlights) will be distributed through various means, including community newspapers.
  - The plan will be made available on the WRIA 8 website and at city halls and libraries.
  - Notice of plan availability will be sent to the WRIA 8 electronic network of interested parties.
  - A presentation will be developed that Steering Committee members and others can present to their respective groups.
  - Four public open houses will be hosted throughout the watershed.
  - There are many entities who are already interested in or should be interested in the plan. These include existing salmon outreach programs, other related but less salmon-oriented outreach programs, special interest groups, those most directly affected by the plan, academic programs, and other salmon planning efforts and related programs. The various marketing tools listed above can be used to inform and coordinate with these groups by Steering Committee members, local jurisdiction partners, and service provider team staff as time and resources permit.
  - Other items such as working with the print and radio media to encourage articles and interviews will be undertaken as time and resources allow.
- Some Steering Committee members also expressed interest in either having a video created or seeing what other salmon-focused efforts have available. **[FOLLOW-UP:** After the work session, the Watershed Coordinator was able to view the 13-minute video that the Tri-County Salmon Coalition has just completed and plans to distribute widely. **WRIA 8 partners are welcome to use this video as well.** It contains common messages and background on the salmon problem as well as what is being done and needs to be done to resolve it. Besides enticing footage of fish and streams, the video features interviews with county executives, Sam Anderson of the Master Builders, our own Terry Lavender, Al Barrie from Mid-Sound Fisheries Enhancement Group, two members of the NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team, and natural resource directors of the Tulalip and Nisqually Tribes. The video highlights the importance of working together to leave a legacy of viable salmon for future generations.]

- **Decision**: The Steering Committee approved the following locations for the four public review open houses:
  - **Renton**, preferably east of I-405. Carco Theater or the adjacent community center were suggested.
  - **Seattle**
  - **Redmond**. Clise Mansion at Marymoor Park was suggested as an easily accessible location. Other possibilities mentioned were the Redmond City Hall and the Senior Center.
  - **Bothell**. The Cascadia Community College was suggested. In addition, committee members recommended that Snohomish County, City of Woodinville, City of Mill Creek, and the Woodinville Water District be invited to co-host with City of Bothell.
- **Decision**: The Steering Committee approved the following dates for the four public review open houses:
  - Tuesday, **November 16<sup>th</sup>**
  - **Either** Wednesday, **December 1<sup>st</sup>** or Thursday, **December 2<sup>nd</sup>**
  - Wednesday, **December 8<sup>th</sup>**
  - Thursday, **December 9<sup>th</sup>**

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Three residents of the City of Sammamish – Ilene Stahl, President of Friends of Pine Lake, Marianne Wilkens, and Wally Pereyra – spoke at the start of the work session about kokanee and the need to protect Ebright Creek in the City of Sammamish.

#### **UPDATES**

- Terry Lavender reviewed the list of projects recommended by the Citizens Advisory Committee for funding through the King County Conservation Futures. Terry and Ruth Norwood also gave a brief report on the success of Redmond Derby Days, which had a salmon theme this year for the Kids Parade.
- Roger Tabor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, summarized results of his study of habitat use of juvenile Chinook salmon in nearshore areas of lakes. The primary nursery area for rearing Chinook is in the southern part of Lake Washington. Roger also made recommendations on types and locations of habitat restoration projects along the lakeshore.

#### **NEXT STEPS/ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED**

- **The next scheduled work sessions are September 22<sup>nd</sup> and October 6<sup>th</sup>.**
- Expected agenda items: the Steering Committee will review and approve the start list, review input from the NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team, and finalize the implementation (adaptive management) framework.
- A number of issues, questions, and suggestions were raised during the work session. The Service Provider Team will bring these back to the Steering Committee at future work sessions. (Some may require additional time and resources to follow through on.)

---

### **Key Decisions from WRIA 8 Steering Committee Work Session #7 September 22, 2004**

**Decisions/Informational items are listed for the following topics. Decision items are shown as Decision.** Other items were points to consider from Steering Committee members.

- Collaborative/regional organizational structure

- Measures and monitoring (decisions)
- Action lists (decisions)
- Funding strategy and level of effort (decisions)
- Feedback from NOAA Fisheries and Shared Strategy

## **COLLABORATIVE/REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

- The Steering Committee directed staff to revise the proposal for an organizational structure to implement the plan. The revised staffing structure should be headed by an executive director-type position, to bring high profile leadership to the implementation effort. This means the duties may need to be re-distributed among that position and two to three other staff. Also, the proposal should consider how to link this organization across WRIAs, possibly to or through Tri-County, and to Shared Strategy/Puget Sound-level effort.
- In the new proposal, the connection between the proposed project committee and staff structure should be outlined to show who on the staff will make sure that habitat projects get done. In addition, more detail is needed about the role of the project committee.
- Planning function, e.g., for coho and other salmonids, is not currently included in expected responsibilities of implementation staff. This may need to be addressed at a later date.
- Implementing the plan will involve at least as much commitment from jurisdictional staff on proposed working committees.
- It may be appropriate to propose a list of tasks that the oversight body and executive director would want to address, such as whether and how to do additional planning (e.g., for coho), how and when to modify the action start lists and comprehensive lists based on adaptive management, and how to allocate regional funding as it ramps up over time.

## **MEASURES AND MONITORING**

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee decided to present to the public the full-scale monitoring proposal that would cost about \$1.85 million annually.
- Monitoring results define success and are important for adaptive management.
- The monitoring recommendation should describe related monitoring that other entities are doing and show how redundancies will be avoided in the WRIA 8 work. The recommendation should also explain why current levels of funding for monitoring by some government agencies will no longer be available due to changing requirements and priorities, budget cuts, etc.
- One option to be considered, perhaps through commitments, is to offer combined regional monitoring that could be “sold” back to individual jurisdictions for their particular needs.

## **ACTIONS START LISTS AND COMPREHENSIVE LISTS**

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved the purposes of the comprehensive action lists:
  - Use anytime throughout the process to identify and implement actions
  - Provide details about needed actions to implementers
  - Offer priorities for stakeholders and jurisdictions to implement locally
  - Provide source for additional input to start-list over time (the start-list is a subset of the comprehensive list.)
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved the purposes of the action start lists:
  - Facilitate input from public and Forum by providing a manageable context for discussion

- **Immediate implementation of actions – use to generate and approve Salmon Recovery Funding Board and King Conservation District grant submittals and other regional funding opportunities for first ten years**
- **Adaptive management tool – use to run the treatment phase of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment model and to revise the action start lists based on results from running the model and from monitoring**
- Following the public review process, the Steering Committee may choose to add five wild card actions to the start list.
- Once the plan is approved and ratified, the oversight body may want to develop a process to modify the action start lists and the comprehensive lists based on adaptive management.

## **FUNDING STRATEGY AND RECOMMENDED LEVEL OF EFFORT**

- **Decision: The Steering Committee decided to recommend a goal of ramping up funding over several years to base level plus 50 percent, about \$17 million annually.**
- The Steering Committee requested more detailed options on how to reach base plus 50 percent, acknowledging that it will take time to ramp up to full funding and capacity.
- It cannot be assumed that base level (equivalent to current funding) will automatically continue. Lobbying efforts for state and federal funding will need to be increased and coordinated among a wider group of jurisdictions than just in WRIA 8. New funding sources will also need to be created.

## **FEEDBACK FROM NOAA FISHERIES AND SHARED STRATEGY**

- In August, the NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team and Puget Sound Shared Strategy met with the WRIA 8 Technical Committee and the service provider team to discuss the June 30<sup>th</sup> Work Product. General comments were favorable about the quality of the analysis and the recommendations. It was also an opportunity to clarify questions about particular items. (The Steering Committee was emailed the written comments from NOAA and Shared Strategy a few weeks ago.)
- Since neither NOAA nor the co-managers supplied numeric ranges and targets for WRIA 8 Chinook stocks, the WRIA 8 Technical Committee is working with Anchor Environmental Consultants to use NOAA's methodology to determine the risk of extinction over different time periods for various abundance levels. This analysis does not answer the fundamental question of population levels that are sustainable and harvestable, but does serve as a milestone along the way to those objectives. This analysis is expected to be available for the public review draft.
- City of Seattle will respond to NOAA's request for additional information on sockeye-Chinook interactions, Cedar flow operations, and the Ballard Locks based on the city's work under its habitat conservation plan and with the Army Corps of Engineers.
- The genetics study that the WRIA 8 Technical Committee has commissioned from the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife is expected to evaluate the level of genetic variation that exists in WRIA 8 to see how much straying has affected independent populations. The Chinook surveys have shown how much hatchery strays contribute to the spawning population; based on last year's survey (the first year large numbers of clipped hatchery fish returned to the spawning grounds), the WRIA average is about 48 percent of all spawners, and 22 percent of spawners in the mainstem Cedar. Initial results of the study are expected to be available in November 2004, and a final report is due in February 2005.
- The co-managers are responsible for determining hatchery and harvest management. NOAA Fisheries has asked how hatchery and harvest management might impact WRIA 8 habitat recommendations.

- The WRIA 8 Technical Committee is working through Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to find out from the co-managers how hatchery management proposals might impact the WRIA 8 habitat strategy for actions. This will be brought to the October 6<sup>th</sup> work session for the Steering Committee to review.
- Elizabeth Babcock, NOAA Fisheries policy lead for Puget Sound, stated that Bob Lohn, Regional Director, is willing to talk with tribal commissioners to seek input from the tribes on hatchery and harvest management issues.

#### **NEXT STEPS/ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED**

- The next scheduled work session is October 6<sup>th</sup>.
- Expected agenda items:
  - Revised proposals based on Steering Committee input for regional/collaborative organizational structure
  - Additional information on the funding strategy and options to reach the Steering Committee's recommended goal of base plus 50 percent. Also, costing methodology for actions on the start lists and an example
  - Expectations from state and federal agencies and others for their role in implementation of the plan along with level and type of commitments recommended for local governments
  - Review of the habitat/hatchery integration analysis the Steering Committee requested of the WRIA 8 Technical Committee that includes input from the co-managers, at least WDFW
  - Is the Steering Committee ready to submit the draft plan to public review?

---

#### **DRAFT Key Decisions from WRIA 8 Steering Committee Work Session #8 October 6, 2004**

**Decisions/Informational items are listed for the following topics. Decision items are shown as Decision.** Other items were points to consider from Steering Committee members.

- Wrap-up of implementation framework: collaborative/regional organizational structure (decisions)
- Costing actions – methodology and an example (decisions)
- Wrap-up of implementation framework: funding (decisions)
- Expectations of non-local-government implementers (decisions)
- Habitat/Hatchery integration analysis (decisions)
- Release of the Steering Committee draft proposal for public review (decision)
- Public review open houses
- Public comment

#### **WRAP-UP OF IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK: COLLABORATIVE/REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved the revised proposal for an organizational structure to implement the plan from the regional perspective. The proposal includes an oversight body, an advisory summit body, several working committees, and shared staff headed by a high-profile executive director-type position. The shared staff will support the committees, advocate for funding, and coordinate implementation of actions in the plan.



- **Decision:** The Steering Committee preferred that the focus of the shared staff be on WRIA 8, although links to and coordination with neighboring WRIsAs and the Puget Sound-level body (such as Shared Strategy) is also important.
- Steering Committee members requested that a recommendation for internships be added to the shared staff. Appropriate duties for interns could include technical work, assistance on public outreach, and working with volunteers or creating a resource list for volunteers organized by others such as basin stewards, Mid-Sound Fisheries Enhancement Group, etc.
- As part of the collaboration at the regional level, local jurisdictions will be asked to continue at a similar level of effort as during the planning stage in order to participate actively on the oversight and summit bodies and the working committees and to work with the shared staff.
- Planning for additional species or other issues is not included in the proposal at this time. The oversight body and appropriate staff may want to address this in the future.
- A role for a body comparable to the WRIA 8 Forum may need to be included to oversee shared budgets and to continue the collaborative relationship built through the Forum. The WRIA 8 Forum may choose to address this issue during its review of the draft plan.

### **COSTING ACTIONS – METHODOLOGY AND AN EXAMPLE**

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved including the ballpark cost estimates for the Tier 1 actions from the start lists, noting that cost estimates for migratory corridors should be added to the version to be presented to the Forum in February 2005.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee directed that the site-specific and the programmatic costs be shown separately and not added into a single figure.
- The cost estimates are planning level tools that will be superseded over time as the actions are refined and revised.
- The cost estimates are a first draft roll-up and the mix of high and low reliability provides a rough average. Cost estimates will be refined as the action start lists are refined through adaptive management.
- Cost estimates will be rolled up across the watershed in the main text of the draft plan. In the appendix, cost estimates by population basin will also be shown.
- Costs for the programmatic actions (land use and public outreach) should be shown for 10 years to better correspond to the plan horizon.
- Although the plan has a ten-year horizon, the start lists are not equivalent to what can or needs to be done in those ten years. Rather, the start lists are meant to show a manageable number (approximately 50 per population basin) of high-priority actions for funding and discussion purposes.
- Completion of the Treatment phase of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment model in 2005 should be used to modify the start lists to give a better sense of what will need to be done get the most “bang” for salmon. Then revising the cost estimates accordingly should help determine what will actions will provide the most “bang for the buck”.
- Cost estimates do not include maintenance of habitat restoration and protection projects. Habitat restoration and protection projects are one-time costs. Programmatic actions may be one time or on-going. However, the cost estimates do not differentiate.
- Cost estimates for the action start lists do not include costs for either monitoring or shared staff to advocate for plan implementation. Those are discussed in other chapters in the plan.

### **WRAP-UP OF IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK: FUNDING**

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved recommending that the goal for level of effort to implement the plan be set at base (current) level plus 50 percent, which is \$17.3 million per year.

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee recognized that extra work will be necessary to maintain current level of funding and to raise the additional funding.
- The Steering Committee expects that funding will ramp up over the first few years of implementation as new funding sources are developed and approved.
- The Steering Committee discussed possible new funding sources at the regional level. Regional could mean WRIA 8, multi-WRIA, or ESU (Puget Sound) level.
- New state sources means money would be outsourced from WRIA 8 jurisdictions and taxpayers. However, Chinook salmon recovery needs to occur at the ESU (Puget Sound) level, not in WRIA 8 alone.

## **EXPECTATIONS OF NON-LOCAL-GOVERNMENT IMPLEMENTERS**

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved the lists of benefits of implementing the plan.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee decided to move one more item to the list of top benefits of implementing the plan. The additional top benefit is legal assurances from federal and state governments to local governments in exchange for commitments to implement the plan.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee decided to include in the draft plan actions that non-local-government entities could choose to implement.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee decided to propose as a starting point a list of possible benefits and assurances that could be considered for negotiations with the federal and state governments in exchange for varying levels of commitment by local governments to implement plan actions and the adaptive management framework.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee decided to offer a menu of mechanisms that could be used seek support from potential non-local-government implementers.
- Information was provided to the Steering Committee on the possibility of “conditional delisting” as an incentive from NOAA Fisheries for local governments and other entities to commit to implementing actions in the recovery plan at the Puget Sound ESU level. This concept is currently under discussion at Shared Strategy; however, there is some question as to whether it would be a viable legal option under the Endangered Species Act.
- Some Steering Committee members requested that language be added regarding the impacts the state and federal governments have had on habitat; e.g., federal and state roads have increased the amount of impervious surface, the federal government helped straighten rivers and build levees that disconnected rivers from their floodplains. Such language could be used in discussions with federal and state governments on the relevance of their role and need for their resources in restoring habitat in WRIA 8.

## **HABITAT/HATCHERY INTEGRATION ANALYSIS**

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved using the precautionary approach of planning for three Chinook salmon populations in WRIA 8 until the results of the genetics study are available and reviewed by NOAA-Fisheries and the co-managers.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee directed the WRIA 8 Technical Committee to be clear in the plan that NOAA-Fisheries determines how many populations of Chinook salmon are in WRIA 8.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee directed the WRIA 8 Technical Committee to be clear that hatchery operations are the purview of the co-managers.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee directed the WRIA 8 Technical Committee to explain the question of the number of populations and to include the matrix on implications of population scenarios for the WRIA 8 habitat strategy and related hatchery issues in the draft plan.

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee directed the WRIA 8 Technical Committee to provide the matrix to the NOAA-Fisheries Technical Recovery Team and the co-managers and to participate in future discussions on this and related topics as NOAA and the co-managers request.
- Habitat improvements are needed whether there turn out to be three, two, or one distinct population(s) in WRIA 8. Habitat improvements are necessary for hatchery populations to support recovery in WRIA 8.
- Steering Committee members requested the opportunity to review the revised language in the draft plan chapters on the science foundation and the conservation strategy before the plan is published for public review.

#### **RELEASE OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR PUBLIC REVIEW**

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee approved release of the draft Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan for public review.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee meetings scheduled for October 28<sup>th</sup> and December 9<sup>th</sup> have been cancelled to encourage participation at the open houses.

#### **PUBLIC REVIEW OPEN HOUSES**

Steering Committee members are invited to attend any or all of the four public review open houses listed below. These will run from 6:30 to 9:00 PM:

RENTON  
Tuesday, November 16  
Maplewood Golf Course Club House  
4050 Maple Valley Hwy

BOTHELL  
Wednesday, December 1  
Northshore Senior Center  
10201 E. Riverside Dr

REDMOND  
Wednesday, December 8  
Redmond Junior High Commons  
10055 - 166<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

SEATTLE  
Thursday, December 9  
REI Flagship Store, South Meeting Rm  
222 Yale Ave N

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Terry Lavender, citizen, presented freshwater mussel identification cards that were produced by volunteers in Water Tenders through a grant from King County. The cards have been distributed to Salmon Watchers and county road crews. Freshwater mussels are important for filtering water. They start out as a parasite on salmon and live to be 120 years old. However, in Bear Creek, there are now none younger than 15 years old, probably because of the decline of salmon populations.

---

### **Key Decisions from WRIA 8 Steering Committee Work Session #9 January 12, 2005**

**Decisions/Informational items are listed for the following topics. Decision items are shown as Decision.** Other items were points to consider from Steering Committee members.

- Proposed Critical Habitat Re-Designation
- Overview of Public Review
- Responding to Public Comments
- Response to NOAA Technical Recovery Team's Comments on Plan
- Start List Changes related to Site-Specific Actions
- Start List Changes related to Land Use Actions

- Comprehensive List Changes related to Site-Specific Actions
- Next Steps

### **Proposed Critical Habitat Re-Designation**

- NOAA Fisheries is seeking comments on their recent Critical Habitat Re-designation. Comments are due by February 14, 2005. Donna Darm, Assistant Regional Administrator, NOAA Fisheries, gave a presentation to the Steering Committee.
- The proposal appears to exclude the North Lake Washington tributaries Chinook salmon population and the Puget Sound nearshore from being designated as critical habitat. However, Donna noted that the ESA Section 7 jeopardy standard is still expected to apply everywhere, including outside the critical habitat designation as well. But it is not clear whether this is the same level of protection as under the adverse modification clause in ESA Section 4 that applies to designated critical habitat.
- The Steering Committee will discuss whether or not they wanted to provide comments at their January 19<sup>th</sup> work session.
- Copies of Donna Darm's presentation will be provided at the January 19<sup>th</sup> work session. Donna will get information from NOAA as requested by committee members on number of stream miles in WRIA 8. Other information on the proposal can be found at NOAA Fisheries website: <http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/1salmon/salmesa/crithab/CHsite.htm>

### **Overview of Public Review**

- Debbie Natelson, WRIA 8 Outreach and Stewardship Coordinator, gave a presentation on the public review process. The process was built on the two phases directed last summer by the Steering Committee. These were (1) need to regenerate interest in salmon and (2) advertise plan release and means to review and comment.
- Initial public outreach started with groups that have already been involved in the WRIA 8 process, including: Water Tenders, Lake Forest Park Stewardship Foundation, Cedar River Council, Friends of the Cedar River Watershed, American Rivers Council, and Puget Sound Anglers. Also coordinated with existing salmon outreach programs, including: Salmon Watchers, Cedar River Naturalists, Beach Naturalists, Stream Team, and Fall for Salmon.
- Expanded outreach on the plan to other less salmon-oriented outreach programs, including: Natural Yard Care Neighborhoods Program, Master Gardeners, Heron Helpers, Native Plant Salvage Program, and EnviroStars.
- Notices were sent to special interest groups including: Fishing Clubs, Mountains-to-Sound Greenway, Cascade Land Conservancy, Washington Native Plant Society, Sierra Club, the Mountaineers, People for Puget Sound, and other non-profits.
- Coordinated with the business community, including: the ESA Business Coalition, the North Seattle Industrial Area Businesses, and the Marine Business Coalition.
- Connected with academic programs including: high school classes, science/eco clubs, and at the college level: Fisheries/ Watershed Studies, Center for Urban Horticulture/Ecological Restoration Program, School of Marine Affairs, Forestry, College of Architecture & Urban Planning/Building Construction, Public Policy & Administration/Government Affairs.
- Press releases were sent to the media. The following newspapers did articles: *The Seattle Times*, *King County Journal* (twice), *Renton Reporter*, *Valley Voice*, *Bothell Bylines*, *Beacon Hill Press*, and there is an upcoming article in the *Daily Journal of Commerce*. There was a radio interview on KUOW, and KVI Home Improvement Show has offered to do a future interview about salmon-friendly building practices.
- There has also been good TV and video coverage: the Tri-County video is available and airs on many local government channels, the public review announcement and Open

House schedule aired on many local government cable channels, and the Seattle Salmon Recovery Forums were televised on the Seattle cable channel.

- The following marketing tools were developed for the public comment process: *We're Fishing for Your Comments* flyer – almost 10,000 were distributed; *Our Kings: Legend or Legacy?* brochure summarizing the plan; and the WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Plan Executive Summary.
- The plan was available: on WRIA 8 website, at 23 city halls, permit centers, and county buildings, and at 34 city and county libraries.
- Presentations were given to the following groups: 9 city councils (there are requests from 9 more governments for presentations upcoming), 4 business groups, the Watershed Stewardship Fair, and to groups represented by Steering Committee members.
- Four Plan Review Open Houses were hosted in Renton, Bothell, Redmond and Seattle. Open Houses were attended by 125 citizens, 8 Steering Committee/Forum members, 11 Steering Committee (non-Forum) members, and 4 Forum members (non-Steering Committee).

### **Responding to Public Comments**

- Cyrilla Cook, WRIA 8 Conservation Plan Manager, gave an overview of the comments received on the plan and proposed how public comments could be processed to facilitate Steering Committee review given the tight timeline.
- In order to have a transparent process, the final plan will include a spreadsheet containing a summary of all public comments and how they are being addressed.
- The proposal was to formally bring to the Steering Committee comments requiring Steering Committee review and decision and/or needing policy discussion and decisions. Comments where changes would not impact salmon or implementers (e.g., clarifying chapter text, clarifying details of an action) would not be formally presented. Also comments where no action is needed because they support what is already in the plan, or are outside the scope of the plan would not be brought forward. Where there is any doubt, comments will be brought to the Steering Committee for review.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee wants to see a summary of all the comments received. The chart does not have to include the proposed response to the comment at this time. The service provider team will attempt to send a rough summary of the comments before the January 19<sup>th</sup> work session.

### **Response to NOAA Technical Recovery Team's Comments on Plan**

- *Brian Murray, King County, WRIA 8 Technical Committee Staff Support, reviewed the WRIA 8 Technical Committee's proposed response to the Puget Sound Technical Recovery Team's (TRT) comments on June Draft WRIA 8 Plan (they did not review the November 12<sup>th</sup> Draft).*
- The TRT's comments to increase the certainty of the plan recommended clarifying our assumptions in ways that will strengthen/enhance the science chapters without changing the substance and called for additional analysis in both the short and long term.

<b>TRT Comments:</b>	<b>WRIA 8 Technical Com. Recommendation for Feb. 2005 Draft</b>	<b>Steering Committee Decision</b>
<b>Clarify and Document Assumptions:</b>		
1. Highlight where multiple lines of evidence are used to link land use, habitat forming processes and habitat condition to Chinook population response; Present any habitat or population data that supports the hypotheses independent of the Ecosystem Diagnostic and Treatment Model (EDT) results	Change. In EDT appendix, add brief overview of consistency of EDT diagnosis with existing studies such as basin plans, Lake Washington research, etc	Agree
2. Create a logic-driven qualitative model between the land use conditions in both watersheds and the habitat-forming processes that could be used to bridge the conceptual gap between watershed condition and EDT	Change. Document how watershed evaluation was used as a check on the validity of EDT inputs and outputs	Agree
3. Include a discussion of the flow: habitat assumptions from the Cedar River Habitat Conservation Plan	Change. Additional materials have been provided by City of Seattle and were sent to the TRT in August 2004. Descriptive information only – no recommendations.	Agree. Will also reference City of Kent HCP currently in development.
4. Examine and discuss the implications of the sockeye hatchery program for the habitat strategy in the Cedar River.	Change. Additional materials have been provided by City of Seattle and were sent to the TRT in August 2004. Descriptive information only – no recommendations.	Agree
5. If there is direct evidence linking land use intensity and changes in habitat condition to any or all Viable Salmonid Populations (VSP) parameters, it should be brought into the plan and documented;	Change. Provide references – Booth, Karr, Konrard, et al, many of which are documented in King County's Best Available Science report	Agree
6. Without investing in the EDT treatment phase, use the diagnostic information to derive some life stage-specific hypotheses for VSP parameters and habitat conditions;	Change. Add matrix explicitly documenting hypotheses in Chapter 4, linking VSP to life stages to key in-stream habitat attributes to landscape factors	Agree
7. Provide empirical evidence of the actions' effectiveness for improving habitat conditions and VSP attributes.	Change. Add peer-reviewed literature citations to support hypotheses about technical recommendations	Agree
8. Include the evaluation of the regulatory and non-regulatory actions in the adaptive management plan.	No Change. Part of adaptive management	Agree

9. Obtain the harvest and hatchery assumptions for the populations and other hatchery programs that affect those populations and clarify the assumptions for effects on the VSP parameters. Use these assumptions to evaluate the interaction of the habitat strategy with the other H strategies	No Change. Implications of hatchery management program assumptions discussed in November draft. <b>PREVIOUSLY REVIEWED BY STEERING COMMITTEE.</b>	Agree
<b>Additional Analyses Recommended for the Near and Long-Term</b>		
1. Discuss the assumptions for current path land use on the protection of existing habitat conditions and VSP parameters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change. For February, include watershed evaluation analysis of 10 years into the future based on the growth in the previous 10 years, identify sub-basins at hi/med/lo risk</li> <li>• No Change. During 2005 – Evaluate impacts of land cover change (from Puget Sound Regional Council) using hydrologic models as an input to EDT</li> <li>• No Change. In the long-term, enhance analysis using growth and land cover projections from the Puget Sound Regional Council and UrbanSim</li> </ul>	Agree, but WRIA 8 Technical Com. should be sure to include the appropriate caveats about the limitations of using past land cover change analysis to predict future land cover conditions. In particular, land cover change over the past ten years does not reflect the impacts of regulatory changes implemented in the 1990s.
2. Use EDT to evaluate the restoration actions proposed in the plan. Document the assumptions used to set the input parameters for this work and compare with the projects derived from the diagnostic phase	No Change – Key task of WRIA 8 Technical Com. 2005 work program.	Agree
3. Conduct a sensitivity analysis of the EDT model so that the relative importance of the assumptions and inputs can be understood.	No Change – Addressed during 2005. Consultant developing tool to conduct sensitivity analysis by spring 2005 for all EDT users.	Agree
4. Begin collecting juvenile survival data for different habitat types used by the populations	No Change – included in monitoring and evaluation chapter (chapter 6), tied to goals and objectives identified in chapter 4.	Agree
5. Using the watershed evaluation as a start, develop and apply an evaluation model to monitor and evaluate suspected mechanisms between land use, processes and habitat conditions	No Change – long term recommendation. Land use and flow process models developed in 2005 with subsequent refinements to reflect Puget Sound Regional Council growth projections.	Agree

6. Develop the monitoring and evaluation elements for the adaptive management program. These elements should be included: decision model, criteria for decision points, metrics, monitoring protocols, data required, management alternatives at decision points.	No Change – 2005 work program	Agree
7. A thorough analysis of the regulatory framework that reveals gaps in protection and evaluates effectiveness should be carried out for these watersheds.	No Change. Partially addressed in 2005 work program through Treatment phase evaluation of future land cover conditions.	Agree
8. Develop recovery goals—even interim ones—for both populations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No Change. Outside of WRIA 8 scope. Interim Recovery Goals may be discussed by WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife at the 1/19/04 Steering Committee work session</li> <li>Change. Range of possible abundance numbers coming from extinction risk analysis. Note that these numbers are for extinction and NOT sustainable/harvestable, and that they will not constitute capital R 'Recovery Goals'. These numbers are intended to be used along with other estimates to help the WRIA 8 Technical Com. identify reasonable long-term objectives that can be used to put habitat actions in the appropriate context (NOTE – analysis is ongoing and not yet reviewed by WRIA 8 Technical Com. as of 1/6/04)</li> </ul>	See text below this chart for details. Add description of various methods used to approximate abundance objectives and results, along with work program for bringing this information to the Steering Committee for discussion of long-term goals. Include information from WA Dept. of Fish and Wildlife if available. Proposed text should be sent to the Steering Com. via email for their approval before including in February draft.

- Other: In their November comment letter, the TRT states that no recovery actions were identified in the WRIA 8 plan. Based on additional discussions with the TRT, it is now apparent that the TRT does not consider an action to be a recovery action until the relative effectiveness at improving VSP attributes has been evaluated. Under this definition, WRIA 8 will not have 'recovery actions' until the Treatment phase (and attendant watershed evaluation of future conditions) is complete in 2005. The TRT committed to providing a letter clarifying this assumption.
- Decision:** Brian Murray asked the Steering Committee if they would be comfortable including long-term abundance measures from the WRIA 8 Technical Committee if they aren't available for review on 1/19/05. The Steering Committee was not comfortable with including long-term abundance measures in the plan without an opportunity to review and discuss the policy implications of these numbers. They decided to include in the plan:



- a description of the methodologies that will be used by the WRIA 8 Technical Committee to develop a range of potential abundance numbers;
- a description of what the results of these methodologies might look like;
- the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's abundance numbers (if these are available in time);
- a work program for developing the potential abundance numbers and presenting this information to the Steering Committee; and
- caveats stating that the abundance objectives are intended to be used to help WRIA 8 gage progress, and do not constitute Recovery Goals as the establishment of Recovery Goals is the purview of the Co-Managers.

### Start List Changes related to Site-Specific Actions

- There were requests to add 22 site-specific actions to the Start List including 3 new Lake Sammamish projects primarily benefiting Kokanee, 9 Cedar River projects, 1 Nearshore project, 3 North Creek projects, and 6 Little Bear projects. Except for the Lake Sammamish projects, the others were all already on the Comprehensive List. The Steering Committee had previously decided that they could add up to five additional actions from public comment to the Start List as "wild cards".
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee decided to add the following site-specific projects as "wild cards" to the Start List:
  1. Daylight Zacusse Creek and enhance mouth (Lake Sammamish kokanee project)
  2. Enhance mouth and lower reaches of Ebright Creek (Lake Sammamish kokanee project)
  3. C252, C256 Cedar River Dorre Don Meanders Reach Acquisition
  4. N379 Work with landowners in reach 5 of North Creek to restore creek.
- **Decision:** There were two requests to remove site-specific projects from the Start List (N367 Floodplain Restoration in reach 2 of North Creek; C216 Study options to protect habitat in reach 4 of the Cedar River and reduce flooding/erosion in Ron Regis Park). The Steering Committee decided not to remove site-specific projects from the Start List.

### Start List Changes related to Land Use Actions

- There was 1 request to remove a land use recommendation from the Start List:

Land Use Actions to be Deleted	Context	Additional Information	Steering Committee <b><u>Decision</u></b>
1. Delete actions that include local jurisdictions as part of solution to instream flows, based on premise that only the state has authority and responsibility to address instream flows. (e.g., N102, N25)	NLW Population, Tiers 1 and 2; not supported by Conservation Strategy	Existing actions supported by local authority over stormwater management, exempt wells, water conservation, HCPs, etc.	Keep in start list as written (see NLW start list, pg. 8, 4 <sup>th</sup> bullet)

- There were 9 requests to change land use recommendations in the Start List. All of these recommended changes provide detail or clarification to existing actions on the Start List; they do not alter the intent of the existing action.

<b>Land Use Actions to be Changed</b>	<b>Context</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>	<b>Steering Committee <u>Decision</u></b>
2. Add specific language to flow-related actions: Determine where illegal surface water withdrawals are happening and enforce the law ....Follow-up on enforcement to ensure withdrawals do not continue.	Applies to Tier 1 in all 3 population areas; consistent with Conservation Strategy	Clarifies/details existing actions	Agreed to change.
3. Add to several actions: additional references to King County Agricultural and Forestry Programs	Applies to Tier 1 in all 3 population areas; consistent with Conservation Strategy	Clarifies/details existing actions	Agreed to change.
4. Add to water quality actions: retrofit stormwater facilities that have been rendered ineffective over time and/or that do not meet current SWM Manual standards.	Applies to Tier 1 in all 3 population areas; consistent with Conservation Strategy	Clarifies/details existing actions	Deferred to January 19 <sup>th</sup> work session.
5. Add to N731 (and add similar action to all 3 populations): procedure to follow up on complaints filed about alleged violations.	Applies to Tier 1 in all 3 population areas; consistent with Conservation Strategy	Clarifies/details existing action	Add to addendum in plan of potential projects raised during public comment process for future analysis.
6. For actions about water quality, stormwater, and forest cover: place more emphasis on low impact development and its benefits (note Snohomish County Sustainable Development Task Force as model).	Applies to Tier 1 in all 3 population areas; consistent with Conservation Strategy	Clarifies/details existing actions; add language in Chaps. 2 and 5	Agreed to change.
7. Change “prohibit new development in floodplains” to “discourage new development in floodplains.” (N15)	NLW Population, Tier 1; not supported by Conservation Strategy	Weakens existing language; change already made to Cedar	For consistency, use Cedar Tier 1 language for all 3 populations: “Limit new development in floodplains and channel migration zones . . . ; develop and apply standards which

Land Use Actions to be Changed	Context	Additional Information	Steering Committee <u>Decision</u>
			minimize impacts to salmon.”
8. Add to action about protecting tree cover in urban areas: In developed urban areas protect remaining trees and encourage reforestation through street tree programs, tree protection regulations, etc. In new developments and plats support replanting and replacement as well as cluster development, recognizing that urban densities require significant tree removal. Add reference to protection of vegetation in sensitive areas through CAO. (C3)	Cedar River Population, Tier 1; consistent with Conservation Strategy	Clarifies/details existing action (language changes clarify what tools best apply in developed vs. undeveloped urban areas)	Agreed to change.
9. Add language to stormwater actions that jurisdictions should adopt and enforce stormwater regulations or programs as part of NPDES Phase 1 and Phase 2 permit requirements.	Cedar River Population, Tier 1; consistent with Conservation Strategy	Clarifies/details existing actions	Agreed to change, include in all populations.
10. Add language to action on protecting riparian vegetation in urban areas: to encourage planting through incentives rather than through prescriptive codes. (C5)	Cedar River Population, Tier 1; consistent with Conservation Strategy	Clarifies/details existing action	Agreed to change.

### Comprehensive List Changes related to Site-Specific Actions

- There were 11 request to add site-specific actions to the Comprehensive List:

Site-Specific Projects to be Added	Context	Additional Information	Steering Com. <u>Decision</u>
<b>Tier 1, Requests to Add New Projects to Comprehensive List</b>			
<p>Add 2 restoration projects to Cedar River:</p> <p>1. Spawning and rearing channel in reach 3 primarily providing spawning habitat for sockeye salmon, but also rearing and refuge habitat for Chinook.</p> <p>2. Landsburg gravel supplementation project – place up to 1,000 cubic yards of spawning gravel per year in reach 18 for 10 years (or 10,000 cubic yards).</p>	<p>1<sup>st</sup> primarily benefits Sockeye, but also provides rearing and refuge habitat for Cedar River Chinook Population; 2<sup>nd</sup> Multi-species benefit; Tier 1 subarea</p>	<p>Has not been reviewed by Cedar River experts or WRIA 8 Technical Committee.</p>	<p>Deferred until January 19<sup>th</sup> for policy discussion on whether or not projects that are already being done by jurisdictions (particularly for mitigation) should be included in the Comprehensive List.</p>
<p>3. Concerns expressed about potential impacts to salmon from the Lake Sammamish Rowing Club on the Sammamish River, Reach 6. Could add restoration project to investigate and mitigate negative potential impacts from Lake Sammamish Rowing Club.</p>	<p>Issaquah Population primarily; Tier 1 migratory</p>	<p>Has not been reviewed by Sammamish River experts or WRIA 8 Technical Committee.</p>	<p>Do not add. (Would need to address motorboats, tubing, etc. to be fair.)</p>
<b>Tier 2, Requests to Add New Projects to the Comprehensive List</b>			
<p>Add 5 restoration projects to North Creek reach 7:</p> <p><b>4. Pond 6, installation of settlement ponds/basins</b> (H Benefit to Chinook, H Feasibility)</p> <p><b>5. Penny Creek culvert replacement</b> (M/L Benefit to Chinook, H Feasibility)</p> <p><b>6. Nickel Creek culvert replacement</b> (L Benefit to Chinook, H Feasibility)</p> <p><b>7. Add conifers along Penny Creek at Mill Creek golf course and install LID rain gardens to reduce erosion</b> (L Benefit to Chinook, H Feasibility)</p> <p><b>8. Add conifers along Penny Creek between Huckleberry and Cottonwood Divisions</b> (L Benefit to Chinook, H Feasibility)</p>	<p>North Lake Washington Population; Tier 2 Subarea; Not inconsistent with Conservation Strategy, but most not high priority for Chinook</p>	<p>Has not been reviewed by North Creek experts or WRIA 8 Technical Committee.</p> <p>H, M, L ratings provided by commenter. No additional information.</p>	<p>Add to addendum in plan of potential projects raised during public comment process for future analysis.</p>

New Projects Related to Noxious Weed Infestations			
9. The Sammamish River is a regional center for infestation for garden loosestrife (a Class B noxious weed). Any areas disturbed during project implementation will be at risk of invasion. Add basinwide recommendation for eradication effort on garden loosestrife throughout Sammamish River.	North Lake Washington and Issaquah Populations; Tier 1 migratory	Has not been reviewed by Sammamish River experts or WRIA 8 Technical Committee.	Do not include in plan. Noxious weeds already addressed adequately in the plan and through other processes.
10. Kelsey/Richard Creeks harbor the most extensive infestation of policeman's helmet (a Class B noxious weed). Add basinwide recommendation for eradication of policeman's helmet throughout Kelsey Creek.	North Lake Washington Population; Tier 2	Has not been reviewed by Kelsey Creek experts or WRIA 8 Technical Committee.	
11. The lower Cedar River is heavily infested with Japanese knotweed. Add basinwide recommendation that large knotweed patches adjacent to habitat protection and restoration projects be controlled (complete eradication is impractical). Eradicate the approximately 10 acres of Japanese knotweed in the Upper Cedar.	Cedar Population; Tier 1 and 2	Has not been reviewed by Cedar River experts or WRIA 8 Technical Committee.	

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee decided to also add the third Lake Sammamish Kokanee project, which is to enhance mouth and lower reaches of George Davis Creek, in an addendum to the Comprehensive List for future analysis (project was initially proposed as a wild card addition to the Start List but not included by the Steering Committee).
- There were 2 requests to remove site-specific actions from the Comprehensive List:

Site-Specific Projects to be Removed	Context	Additional Information	Steering Com. <u>Decision</u>
1. Remove Cedar River restoration project <b>C213 Explore additional modification of Elliot levee (lowering) to allow greater flow into constructed side channel.</b> Commenter opposed due to mitigation obligations (built as mitigation project) and concern that increasing flow behind levee will increase property damage. Question ecological benefit of project.	Cedar River Population; Tier 1 subarea	Project rated as H/M Benefit to Chinook and L Feasibility. Concerns about proposed project reflected in notes in Comp. list.	Remove from Comprehensive List.

2. Remove Cedar River restoration project <b>C202 Remove Bridges at Mouth of Cedar River and South Boeing Bridge (explore possibility if area is redeveloped)</b> . Use of bridges expected to continue beyond first 10-year implementation stage of plan.	Cedar River Population; Tier 1 subarea	Project rated as M Benefit to Chinook; L Feasibility. Concerns about proposed project reflected in notes in Comp. list.	Defer to Jan. 19th when a Boeing representative could be present for discussion.
--	--	---	--

### Next Steps

- **Decision:** Jane Lamensdorf-Bucher, WRIA 8 Watershed Coordinator, requested guidance from the Steering Committee on how to prioritize work products for the January 19<sup>th</sup> work session. The Steering Committee prioritized the service provider team's tasks as follows:
  1. Prepare policy issues for discussion by the Steering Committee at the January 19<sup>th</sup> work session.
  2. Write up and circulate the January 12<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee decisions.
  3. Prepare and send out to the Steering Committee a summary of all the comments received on the plan.
- The service provider team will strive to get all of these items done prior to the January 19<sup>th</sup> work session, but will prioritize their work per the Steering Committee's guidance.

---

## Key Decisions WRIA 8 Steering Committee Work Session #10 January 19, 2005

**Decisions/Informational items are listed for the following topics. Decision items are shown as Decision.** Other items were points to consider from Steering Committee members.

- Land Use Policy Decisions
- Changes to Commitments of Local Governments and Expectations of Non-Local Government Entities
- Changes to Comprehensive Lists of Actions
- Changes to Organizational Structure and Funding
- Changes to Measures and Monitoring
- Other Changes to Draft Plan
- Role of Steering Committee during Forum Review
- Response to NOAA Fisheries' Proposed Critical Habitat Designation
- Plan Ready to Submit to the Forum?

Most of the day's focus was to determine whether and how the Steering Committee wanted to respond to changes proposed to different chapters and sections of the WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan through the public review process.

### Land Use Policy Decisions

<b>Requested Change, Addition, or Deletion from Public Comment</b>	<b>Steering Committee <u>Decision</u></b>
Add to existing actions: Nominate high quality headwaters and spawning habitat as Outstanding Resource Waters (all 3 populations)	Add this action with additional introductory language: "Jurisdictions should coordinate with appropriate entities to nominate..."
Add to existing actions: Clarify reference to best available science – WRIA 8 conservation strategy <i>is one of many available</i> BAS resources (Cedar, applies to all 3)	Add this clarification as proposed.
Add to existing actions: specific references to SR-520, I-405, and new SR-520 bridge in water quality actions (Cedar, North Lake Washington [NLW] tributaries, Migratory)	Make sure existing actions identify need to address stormwater impacts from major transportation and other projects (including new and expanded roads) proposed during 10-year time frame; do not add references to specific roads. Note impacts are from existing and future road runoff.
Add to existing actions: Support update of 1993 North Creek Watershed Plan and 2002 Drainage Needs Report to address groundwater detention and recharge (NLW Tier 2)	Add this clarification as proposed.
Add to existing actions: Address application of herbicides on aquatic weeds, involve State Depts. of Ecology and Agriculture (Migratory)	Do not add this clarification to existing action; add to existing action: "coordinate with relevant agencies."
Add details to actions about altered hydrology and oil spills (Nearshore)	Do not make this clarification.

<b>Requested Change, Addition, or Deletion from Public Comment</b>	<b>Steering Committee <u>Decision</u></b>
Add new action: Snohomish and King Counties should prohibit mining operations that damage Chinook habitat (not sure where applies).	Put this action on addendum for further analysis. Word the action as: "Counties should adopt regulations to provide for: (1) a more comprehensive review of proposed gravel mining developments adjacent to or near waterways affecting salmonid streams; and (2) an increase in enforcement activity for clearing and grading and erosion control violations, especially in sensitive areas and near waterways affecting salmonid streams."
Add new action: Require septic tanks to be pumped and inspected every five years (could apply to all 3 populations)	Do not add this action; it is sufficiently covered by existing laws.
Add to existing actions: retrofit stormwater facilities that have been rendered ineffective over time (all 3 populations)	Do not add this language. Do add action from Issaquah start list to other start lists, but amend it as follows: "Identify water quality problems and address through stormwater management programs (including low impact development best management practices), current and future TMDLs, and livestock management programs, and <i>upgrade stormwater facilities, where possible, to improve water quality and flows.</i> "
Change existing actions: Change "should not move urban growth area (UGA)" to "consider impacts to salmon ... habitat when considering whether to move UGA" (NLW Tiers 1 and 2)	Word this action as: "jurisdictions should not move urban growth area boundary in Bear and Little Bear subareas, unless such change is beneficial to salmon."

Delete or change existing actions: on forest cover, transferable development rights, non-conforming uses, and low impact development (NLW Tier 2)	Do not change existing actions.
Delete existing actions about coordinating with South King County Groundwater Management Committee (Cedar Tiers 1 and 2)	Do not delete existing action.
Delete existing action about considering impacts of climate change on flows (Cedar Tier 1)	Do not delete existing action; add “coordinate with Shared Strategy’s chapter on climate change.”

### Changes to Commitments of Local Governments and Expectations of Non-Local Government Entities

Public Comment/Issue	Steering Committee Direction to Date	Response Options	Steering Cmte. <u>Decision</u>
<p>1. Level of commitments requested of local governments. There was a range of comments at both ends of the spectrum, although more called for firmer commitments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require local governments to implement plan by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>codifying plan recommendations</li> <li>setting a minimum bar to be eligible for funding</li> <li>adopting regulations, incentives, outreach before seeking more funding</li> <li>signing formal interlocal agreements</li> <li>directing funding priorities for open space to plan implementation</li> <li>requiring clear structure to show how implementation and enforcement will occur</li> <li>creating basin concurrency levels as for drinking water, traffic</li> </ul> </li> <li>Local governments should set their own priorities, have flexibility on how to implement plan</li> </ul>	<p>Steering Committee recommended as a minimum commitment from local governments: “city/county councils pass resolutions to <b>formally consider plan as guidance and best available science</b> for capital improvement projects, critical areas ordinances, comprehensive plan updates, NPDES [pollution discharge] permits, required under state law”. Steering Committee also offered two additional other <b>options for local governments choosing to make a higher level of commitment</b>. These are local councils commit to implement particular actions or local governments ratify/adopt the entire plan as policy). See Chapter 8.</p>	<p>NO CHANGE -- Plan offers a range for local governments to choose among. Topic for Forum to discuss further.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>



<p>2. Expectations of non-local governmental entities. Comments seek firmer requests of federal and state govt.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify that future transportation and infrastructure planning incorporate WRIA 8 plan and reflect salmon habitat needs</li> <li>• Get agreements and specificity from federal and state governments on items such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– harvest and hatcheries</li> <li>– delisting criteria</li> <li>– legal assurances</li> <li>– rewards/incentives for implementation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Collaborate on lobbying and other means to seek federal and state assurances and funding</li> <li>• Comments request role for private lands.</li> </ul>	<p>Steering Committee recommended that “recovery of salmon be undertaken by a <b>broad partnership that reaches beyond local governments to include citizens, homeowners, community groups, non-profit agencies, businesses, developers, public agencies, and the co-managers.</b>” The plan offers <b>examples of what these entities can implement.</b> The plan also includes tools for non-local governments to show support of plan implementation as well as various means to request this support. See Chapter 8.</p>	<p>ADD CLARIFYING DETAIL -- Plan offers recommendations for support and participation by others. Could add more details to list of examples of what is requested from state and federal government and how to request it. Plan offers examples, particularly in public outreach actions, of opportunities for non-governmental entities.</p>	<p>Agreed. Also add language that implement-ing jurisdictions and stakeholders should coordinate lobbying efforts. Note that federal govt has long-term obligation to help because their earlier actions impacted watershed over long term.</p>
<p>3. Local governments should get credit for implementing habitat restoration actions, including past projects done voluntarily</p>	<p>Steering Committee has not discussed this issue.</p>	<p>SEPARATE PROPOSAL – In the interests of meeting the plan schedule, a proposal is coming to the Steering Committee to recommend scoping a progress report that could include current and past actions. The scoping process would allow more time to discuss the question as well as contents, such as types of actions to be included and appropriate time period.</p>	<p>Approved. The progress report will be scoped after the plan goes to the Forum for review and approval.</p>

4. Use mitigation as a vehicle for plan implementation	The Steering Committee has recommended that other efforts such as state transportation projects (e.g., rebuilding Hwy 520, widening I-405) implement or fund actions in the WRIA 8 plan for their mitigation. However, the Steering Committee has not discussed whether to give credit to actions local governments are required to do as mitigation under other laws.	<p>ADD CLARIFYING LANGUAGE in Chapter 8, Commitments and Expectations, to give examples of state projects that should implement or fund WRIA 8 plan actions as mitigation.</p> <p>A proposal will be made at the January 19<sup>th</sup> work session to scope a progress report on current actions local governments and others are already taking that benefit salmon. As part of that scoping, there could be discussion on whether or how to give credit for mitigation already required under laws or permits.</p>	Agreed to both parts. Examples of state projects should be listed with statement that as future projects come up, those should also be included.
--	--	---	--

### Changes to Comprehensive Lists of Actions

Decisions Related to Site Specific Project Actions on Comprehensive Lists:

- Requests to Add Site-Specific Projects to the Comprehensive Lists

Site-Specific Projects to be ADDED	Context/ Past Steering Committee Direction	Additional Information	Potential Response	Steering Committee <u>Decision</u>
<p>Add 2 restoration projects to Cedar River:</p> <p>1. Spawning and rearing channel in reach 3 primarily providing spawning habitat for sockeye salmon, but also rearing and refuge habitat for Chinook.</p> <p>2. Landsburg gravel supplementation project – place up to 1,000 cubic yards of spawning gravel per year in reach 18 for 10 years (or 10,000 cubic yards).</p>	<p>#1 primarily benefits Sockeye, but also provides rearing and refuge habitat for Cedar River Chinook Population; #2 has Multi-species benefit; Tier 1 subarea.</p> <p>Has not been reviewed by Cedar River experts or WRIA 8 Technical Committee. The Steering Committee approved the process for development of the Comprehensive List.</p>	Deferred from January 12 <sup>th</sup> until January 19 <sup>th</sup> for policy discussion on whether or not projects that are already being done by jurisdictions (particularly for mitigation) should be included in the Comprehensive List.	SEPARATE PROPOSAL: See “Proposal to Scope a Report on Current Actions Under Way to Benefit Chinook Salmon Habitat”. A separate report could be scoped as an early progress report on the plan.	Projects will be considered in proposed Report on Current Actions Under Way to Benefit Chinook Salmon Habitat to be scoped after the plan is finalized.

- Requests to Remove Site-Specific Projects from the Comprehensive Lists

<b>Site-Specific Projects to be REMOVED</b>	<b>Context/ Past Steering Committee Direction</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>	<b>Potential Response</b>	<b>Steering Cmte. <u>Decision</u></b>
3. Remove <b>C202 Remove Bridges at Mouth of Cedar River and South Boeing Bridge (explore possibility if area is redeveloped and therefore bridges are no longer needed)</b> . Use of bridges expected to continue beyond first 10-year implementation stage of plan.	Cedar River Population; Tier 1 subarea  The Steering Committee approved the process for development of the Comprehensive List.	Project rated as Medium Benefit to Chinook; Low Feasibility. Concerns about proposed project reflected in notes in Comprehensive list.	KEEP ON LIST OR REMOVE: Decision deferred from January 12 <sup>th</sup> until Jan. 19 <sup>th</sup> when Boeing representative could be present for discussion. Could keep on Comprehensive List given that proposed project came out of WRIA 8 process and the project description reflects the uncertainty of situation and the concerns that have been raised OR could remove from list given the relatively low rating this project received.	Remove project C202 from Comprehensive List.

- Requested Changes to Comprehensive Lists Related to Site-Specific Projects

<b>Requested CHANGES to Site-Specific Projects</b>	<b>Context/ Past Steering Committee Direction</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>	<b>Potential Response</b>	<b>Steering Committee <u>Decision</u></b>
1. 6 commenters were concerned about recommendations to add large woody debris to Cedar River and Sammamish River due to potential hazard posed to river users such as boaters and swimmers. They had specific recommendations to minimize the danger such as wood being placed only by licensed engineer, and project teams consulting with organized river groups in project design.	Cedar and North Lake Washington Populations; Tier 1  Steering Committee has recognized that the Conservation Strategy highlights the importance of LWD for salmon, but also the need for public safety.		ADD CAVEAT: Could add language about needing to reduce potential hazard of large woody debris placement to river users with recommendations for how it should be done to Introduction to Chapter 9 Start List and Chapter 10 Comprehensive List.	Agreed.

<p>2. Had 2 potentially conflicting comments about beavers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One was concerned that beavers have caused fish barriers on Bear Creek that should be removed.</li> <li>The other said that Little Bear and North Creek need more beavers and recommended changing land use adjacent to prime beaver habitat to permit greatest extent of beaver usage.</li> </ul>	<p>North Lake Washington Population; Tiers 1 and 2</p> <p>Steering Committee has not discussed.</p>		<p>FUTURE ANALYSIS: Could add to addendum for future analysis.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>
<p>3. Commenter requests edit to Cedar River <b>C201 Explore Opportunities to Improve Habitat in Reach 1</b>. "If existing land uses change in the future, explore opportunities to <del>reduce channel confinement</del>, increase riparian function and increase LWD." Says that reducing channel confinement is impractical in urban center.</p>	<p>Cedar Population; Tier 1</p> <p>The Steering Committee approved the process for development of the Comp. List.</p>	<p>Rated Medium Benefit to Chinook, Low Feasibility</p>	<p>ADD TO COMMENTS OR ACCEPT EDIT: Could add notes to the Comment section stating that reducing channel confinement in urban center would be very difficult OR accept proposed edit.</p>	<p>Keep project description as it is currently. Add to notes for project about the difficulty of reducing channel confinement in urban setting and the need to consult with the Corps of Engineers on any project in this reach of the Cedar River.</p>
<p>4. Commenter comments on <b>C209 Maplewood Neighborhood flood buyouts and floodplain restoration</b> and other Cedar River flood buyouts. Buyouts by themselves provide no benefit to fish. Buyouts only have benefit in coordination with comprehensive habitat restoration in area of buyout. Hard to justify spending regional funding on flood buyouts when caused by one jurisdiction's past land use decisions and piece-meal nature of buying homes only from willing sellers makes it difficult to amass enough buyouts for habitat restoration to occur.</p>	<p>Cedar Population; Tier 1</p>	<p>C209 rated High Benefit to Chinook, Low Feasibility.</p>	<p>ADD CLARIFYING LANGUAGE: Could add to notes for Cedar River flood buyout and floodplain recommendations acknowledging that buyouts alone do not provide significant benefits to Chinook. They are only a first phase of a future restoration effort.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

5. Public commenter expressed hope that planned Lakeshore Landing Development could extend wildlife habitat that Gene Coulon Park provides to the North along Lake Washington shoreline and incorporate low impact development elements.	Cedar Population; Tier 1 Migratory		ADD TO COMMENT SECTION OR NO ACTION: Could add as opportunity in notes for Lake Washington project <b>C270 Shoreline Restoration</b> OR could take no action because not enough is known about this development.	No action.
--	---------------------------------------	--	--	------------

### Changes to Organizational Structure

Public Comment/Issue	Steering Committee Direction to Date	Response Options	Additional Information	Steering Cmte. <u>Decision</u>
1. Continued collaboration, including shared staff. A spectrum of comments ranged from support to questioning the need for shared staff and collaboration	Chapter 2 proposes that jurisdictions and stakeholders continue to collaborate on monitoring, reporting progress to the public and electeds, and seeking funding	NO CHANGE. By far the majority of comments on this topic were supportive of the Steering Committee's proposal.		Agreed.
2. Role of the Forum in implementation	Organizational structure includes an oversight body and a summit body; membership not yet specified	OPTIONS TO ADDRESS: 1) Forum to discuss 2) Propose joint session or conference committee of Steering Committee and Forum 3) Specify membership of oversight and summit bodies 4) Postpone due date of plan for additional discussion	If there is another interlocal agreement, local governments as funders may want a Forum-type body to oversee budget	Agreed to options 1 and 2.
3. Communicating progress should include landowners	Progress reports will be developed and widely shared.	ADD CLARIFYING DETAILS in Chapter 2 to share progress reports with landowners		Agreed.
4. Consider executive director position to be shared across all King County WRIAs, have WRIA-specific coordinators to ensure watershed interests	Executive director position was recommended to keep focus in WRIA 8 on implementing plan actions, lobbying for funding.	NO CHANGE at this time until the other King County WRIAs are ready to discuss their organizational structures for implementation.	WRIA 8 is ahead of the other King County WRIAs in discussions on organizational structure.	Agreed.

<b>Public Comment/Issue</b>	<b>Steering Committee Direction to Date</b>	<b>Response Options</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>	<b>Steering Cmte. <u>Decision</u></b>
5. Keep WRIA 8 Technical Committee	Organizational structure includes WRIA 8 Technical Committee	NO CHANGE – Already included in Chapter 2		Agreed.

### Changes to Funding

<b>Public Comment/Issue</b>	<b>Steering Committee Direction to Date</b>	<b>Response Options</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>	<b>Steering Cmte. <u>Decision</u></b>
1. Funding implementation. Comments offered a range, many of which are tied to and covered in the commitments discussion. Included were comments to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• keep current funding in place</li> <li>• prioritize local programs to fund plan implementation</li> <li>• reduce property taxes as incentive to landowners to implement actions</li> <li>• accept charitable contributions</li> </ul>		ADD CLARIFYING DETAILS to include appropriate new examples of funding sources and incentives that commenters offered. Also, see response under commitments topic.		Agreed.
2. Joint funding of stewards	Organizational structure discussion said do not cost-share public outreach, but Table 7-1 on Capacity to Implement the WRIA 8 Plan at Various Funding Levels says stewards could be funded regionally as an action.	NO CHANGE – Plan offers option of funding stewards as regional action.	Many jurisdictions staff these functions in different ways.	Agreed.
3. Surface water management fees should be applied only to drainage issues and not habitat actions	Local utility fees are used in part to fund habitat actions. See Chapter 7.	ADD CLARIFYING LANGUAGE – In the funding chapter (Chapter 7), add language that clarifies that each funding source is applied as per the legal restrictions, authority, and choices of the funding agency.		Agreed.

4. Relate funding to recovery objectives	Funding strategy is based on current spending plus additional percentage Steering Committee believes necessary to change the decline in Chinook population to a gain. In addition, the Steering Committee has directed the WRIA 8 Technical Committee to undertake the Treatment phase of the Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment model along with other analysis to better understand how far suites of proposed actions will move towards habitat improvements that benefit Chinook salmon. This work is expected to take about 10 months.	NO CHANGE -- Further explanation can be found in Chapter 7.		Agreed.
5. Add economic benefits of sustainable stormwater management and low impact development	The land use actions include recommendations on stormwater management and low impact development	NO CHANGE – Appendix D-3-2 lists several references on these topics.		Agreed.

### Changes to Measures and Monitoring

Comment (Summarized)	Proposed Response	Steering Cmte. <u>Decision</u>
1. When monitoring, collect information for multiple species, not just Chinook.	<i>Direction was to focus on habitat and chinook, but incorporate multispecies where possible.</i> Some of the monitoring elements are already multispecies where would not incur additional costs.  CHANGE: Note in the text those monitoring components that are multispecies, such as smolt trapping or watershed evaluation (EMAP).	Agreed.
2. The WRIA should monitor Low Impact Development (LID) projects.	<i>Direction was to focus on areas of greatest uncertainty and “audit” other types of projects.</i> The Plan states that specific project implementation monitoring plans will not be developed until after ratification of the plan.  CHANGE: Could insert text stating that developing specific implementation monitoring plan would be on the 2005 work plan for the Technical Committee.	Agreed.

3. The WRIA should focus on quantifiable, system level measures to gauge the success of the Plan. The Plan should “market” the benefits of system level monitoring for politicians and other decision-makers.	<p><i>Direction was to focus on cumulative (system) monitoring for both habitat and chinook.</i> The Plan includes the recommended monitoring, but as many aspects of the Plan, does not currently have a funding mechanism or designated lead entity.</p> <p>CHANGE: Recommend inserting a paragraph at the beginning of the chapter describing the Steering Committee priority for cumulative monitoring and why.</p>	Agreed.
4. The Plan should emphasize that the WRIA does not set population thresholds or delisting criteria. Need to clarify that this is not project level monitoring.	<p>Language regarding population parameters for use in delisting is already in the draft under Validation monitoring.</p> <p>CHANGE: A) Insert similar population threshold language in the cumulative monitoring section. B) Insert sentence in to state that the implementation (project) monitoring will not require chinook population response monitoring.</p>	Agreed.
5. Add riparian index as part of the evaluation of riparian areas.	<p>The cumulative monitoring includes a generic evaluation of riparian condition, but does not include specific recommendation for riparian index.</p> <p>CHANGE: insert riparian index as a potential option under cumulative monitoring.</p>	Agreed.
6. Need to have thresholds for performance identified in the monitoring, with pre-determined responses if performance does not meet targets. There is little opportunity for the public to evaluate or challenge compliance with the adaptive management commitments.	<p>Cannot include thresholds or “triggers” until commitments and funding are understood.</p> <p>CHANGE: Insert language that states additional work on decision-making processes will need to be conducted in 2005, after ratification.</p>	Agreed.

#### Other Changes to Draft Plan

- Public comments related to schedule and process:

Comment/Issue	Steering Committee Direction to Date	Steering Committee <u>Decision</u>
<p>1. Not enough time to review document/ extend the comment period</p> <p>Delay action on plan until genetics study completed</p> <p>Move plan quickly through Forum and jurisdictions to keep momentum for action implementation going</p>	<p>Decisions 7/22/03 on schedule for plan delivery to Forum</p> <p>Decisions 4/28/04 on public comment period process</p> <p>Decision 10/06/04 to continue with plan; address genetic study results when available through adaptive management</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Use adaptive management process to incorporate new guidance</p>



2. Delete recommendation that Issaquah restoration be put on hold	<p>Decision on 4/10/04; keep plan actions consistent with precautionary approach recommended by conservation strategy</p> <p>Decision on 10/06/04; hold on changes addressing plan priorities until genetic study results completed and reviewed by Steering Committee, NOAA Fisheries Technical Recovery Team</p>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Stay with precautionary approach; use adaptive management processes to make changes</p>
3. Plan should include multi-species approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ecosystem-based, with Chinook focus.</li> <li>• Habitat modeling includes coho</li> <li>• Will monitor habitat for multi-species</li> <li>• Can run Chinook actions through model to see if benefit to coho</li> <li>• Additional analysis needed to develop conservation strategy and actions</li> </ul>	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>Move forward with submittal to Forum</p>

- Public comments requesting additional analyses:

<b>Comment/Issue</b>	<b>Steering Committee Direction to Date</b>	<b>Steering Committee <u>Decision</u></b>
4. Needs cost-benefit analysis so prioritization is based on outcome and dollars spent efficiently	Decision has been to move forward with plan without this analysis; incorporate results of Treatment phase of Ecosystem Diagnosis and Treatment model and other new information as part of adaptive management	<p>NO CHANGE</p> <p>(Cost estimates already included in plan. Incorporate new information about relative benefits of actions through adaptive management process)</p>
5. Include impacts of major transportation and other projects proposed during 10 year time frame. Both I-405 and SR-520 lack water detention//treatment facilities, and are proposing to add acres of new pavement that will not be addressed.	<p>Take advantage of other planning efforts</p> <p>Be coordinated with responses to the Clean water act</p> <p>The land use actions currently address the need for water quality improvements.</p>	NO CHANGE. See decisions under land use regarding how to address impacts

- Public comments requesting major format changes:

<b>Comment/Issue</b>	<b>Steering Committee Direction to Date</b>	<b>Steering Committee <u>Decision</u></b>
6. Include reach maps		NO CHANGE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Technical Committee will make maps available on web site.</li> <li>Web site location will be printed in plan</li> </ul>
7. Move background information to appendices to improve readability	Be presented as multiple volumes or chapters that can be understood by and directed to different audiences.	CHANGE Service Provider (ILA) Team proposes to divide plan into three volumes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Volume I : Chapters 1-9 (includes start list)</li> <li>Volume II (comprehensive list, including methodology)</li> <li>Volume III –all other supporting information (technical appendices and other appendices)</li> <li>Introductory language will be provided in each volume describing where to find things</li> </ul>

- Requests to Add Public Outreach Actions to the Comprehensive Lists

<b>Proposed Addition to Comprehensive Lists</b>	<b>Context</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>	<b>Steering Committee <u>Decision</u></b>
1. Add Cedar River Naturalist Program to outreach actions	Cedar Population, all tiers. Program addresses many elements of Conservation Strategy.	Omission was oversight; program mentioned in funding section of plan, but not listed as an action in Comprehensive List.	CHANGE  Add action to public outreach section of Cedar Comprehensive List

- Requested Changes to Comprehensive Lists Related to Public Outreach

<b>Proposed Changes to Comprehensive Lists</b>	<b>Context</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>	<b>Steering Committee <u>Decision</u></b>
2. Sammamish River Trail should be the main site for interpretation.	North Lake Washington Tributaries Population; Tier 1 Production Subarea, Sammamish River Sub-basin. Supports Conservation Strategy.	Action list currently recommends interpretive signs, but the public outreach actions do not list specific locations	NO CHANGE  (Do not add site-specific locations to the public outreach actions list)

<p>3. Change Site Specific action C10 to a public outreach action...effort to better educate the public about the habitat benefits of having large woody debris in streams and rivers will reduce the demand from the public to remove it.</p> <p>The pamphlet on river safety ...cited in ...plan should reference to the danger of large woody debris and other objects that act as strainers. ...ensure that future printings include this very serious issue.</p>	<p>Cedar River Population, Tier 1. Consistent with conservation strategy.</p>	<p>Augment actions with clarifying details.</p>	<p>CHANGE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add clarifying language about large woody debris and boaters</li> <li>• Include targeting education of youth</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--

### Other Plan-Related Items

- The November 12<sup>th</sup> Draft WRIA 8 Plan included “ballpark” cost estimates for Tier 1 actions on the Action Start List. Similar estimates for migratory and Tier 2 actions on the Start List were not able to be developed in time to meet the publication deadline . As promised by the Service Provider Team, migratory and Tier 2 “ballpark” estimates have been developed using the same methodology as presented at the October work session of the Steering Committee. A summary was handed out at the January 19<sup>th</sup> work session. These estimates will be included in the next draft plan for Forum review.
- At the January 12<sup>th</sup> work session, Steering Committee members asked to see a summary of all the public comments received. A summary of all the public comments was sent out via email and also handed out at the work session.

### Role of Steering Committee during Forum Review

- The interlocal agreement (ILA) among local governments cost-sharing the development of the Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan calls for the Steering Committee to submit the plan to the WRIA 8 Forum for review and either approval or remand back for changes. Under the ILA, the Forum has 90 days to do this.
- There is overlapping membership between the two groups. About one-third of the Forum members are regular members of the Steering Committee, including the Steering Committee co-chairs and the Forum chair. When Forum members who serve as alternates to Steering Committee members are included, about half the Forum is represented on the Steering Committee.
- Assuming there is a Salmon Recovery Funding Board process in 2005, the Steering Committee will be convened to rank and select projects as in previous years.
- **Decision:** The Steering Committee discussed options for their role during the Forum's review of the draft plan. Steering Committee members agreed to the following:
  1. Service Provider Team will provide regular email updates to the Steering Committee and distribute a calendar of Forum agenda topics related to the Forum's plan review (once it is developed). All Steering Committee members will receive emails sent to Forum members on the plan review.

2. Non-electeds who are members of the Steering Committee can provide input through electeds.
  3. Non-elected members of the Steering Committee can attend Forum meetings and provide input on particular agenda topics.
- If necessary, the Steering Committee could ask the Forum if they would be interested in a “conference committee” consisting of Steering Committee representatives and Forum representatives who could propose options on areas of concern or disagreement. The Steering Committee did not want to set up a “conference committee” at this time, but do want to keep this idea as an option.

### **Response to NOAA Fisheries’ Proposed Critical Habitat Designation?**

- **Decision:** Based on the Steering Committee’s discussion, the Service Provider Team will draft a letter to NOAA Fisheries regarding the proposed critical habitat designation and circulate it via email for Steering Committee review.

### **Plan Ready to Submit to the Forum?**

- **Decision:** The Steering Committee agreed that the draft WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan is ready to go the Forum for review with the changes approved in response to public comment.

WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

identifier	subject	summary of comment	Response to Comments
13.6	commitment	use formal interlocal agreements, include adoption of SWM manual, make clear legal assurances and agency requirements	No revisions -- already in plan. See Chapter 8.
21.3	commitment	need legislation to implement plan, CAOs	No revisions -- already in plan. See Chapter 8.
25.1	commitment	support stakeholders working together, use of Adaptive Management, hope to see implementation not just sit on shelf	No revisions requested- supports plan
25.2	commitment	supports increased funding recommendations and sources, contingent on government's use of regulatory tools	Revised Chapter 8
26.1	commitment	support plan, hope have political will to implement	No revisions requested- supports plan
31.4	commitment	negotiations with feds needed for effective agreements on h's, delisting criteria. Avoid one size fits all	Revised Chapter 8, see section on benefits to negotiate with regulating agencies
33.07	commitment	make clearer the role that private lands should have on recovery	No revisions -- already in plan. See Chapter 8. In addition, Chapters 10-14 in Volume II list hundreds of actions, some of which can be undertaken on private lands.
39.4	commitment	need memos of understanding/agreement for the financial basis of this plan	No revisions -- already in plan. See chapters 7 and 8. Will need further discussion and negotiation among local governments.
42.2	commitment	recommendations for commitments	No revisions -- supports plan.
44.5	commitment	plan hasn't gone far enough to require jurisdictions to improve habitat condition (voluntary process)	No revisions -- Chapter 8 offers a range of commitment levels. Further discussion is needed among local governments to determine how and whether to ratify.
45.2	commitment	unclear how proposed WRIA 8 actions will be interpreted by NOAA Fisheries, and how we can ever find this information out	No revisions -- Chapter 8 includes items that could be negotiated with federal agencies by local governments.
45.3	commitment	plan needs to have mechanisms to get WSDOT and DOE to take action. Should it lobby, or what other methods?	Revised Chapter 8 to clarify opportunities for state agencies to act and to recommend collaboration on lobbying.
47.1	commitment	strongly support fed and state rewards/incentives for ESA compliance. Like middle option of local govt. commitments	Revised Chapter 8 to include this suggestion.
11.5	commitments	increase public outreach messages that everyone should pay for protection	No revisions. See chapters 7 and 8.
53.03	commitments	local governments should get credit for implementing habitat restoration activities, including past projects done voluntarily.	No revisions. See Steering Committee key decisions from 1/19/05 about scoping early progress report on actions under way.
53.33	commitments	parks staff supports ratification option that allows the city to make its own decisions about land use policies, future economic development and growth, and projects within city parks	No revisions -- already in plan as option for commitments in Chapter 8.
53.47	commitments	clarify whether funding strategy would commit utility and other funding jurisdictions have autonomy over to the WRIA organization and staffing.	Revised Chapter 7 to clarify this.
39.1	format	move back-up data to appendices	Revised
39.2	format	add Table of Contents to this chapter	Revised
42.1	format	keep the quick road map	Revised - added new information to road map
52.04	format	can't see Urban Growth Area coverage well on map	No revisions - can't improve due to scale of map
52.26	format	Basinwides should be added for Tier 2 in NLW	Revised- added clarifying language for technical recommendations for Tier 2 and Steering Committee direction to limit Tier2 actions on the startlist to 5
52.33	format	basinwides mixed up with site-specific recs. Separate.	No revisions - consistent with form of plan
52.41	format	concur with actions; good PO audiences; chap 10 pagination confusing	Revised - Chapter 10 moved to Volume II; page numbers corrected; table of contents added
47.14	format/provide more information	move appendices to separate document. Clarify whether Appendix D recommendations are consistent with GMA	Revised - menu of actions revised, now located in Volume I

# WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

11.1	funding	burden of paying for protection will unfairly fall on minority of population--to be fair, need to purchase these properties rather than regulate (buffers), using funds paid for by full population	Revised Chapter 8 on commitments to show this concern.
11.8	funding	increase lobbying to raise funds for purchase of lands to be protected	Revised Chapter 8 to include collaborative lobbying.
12.2	funding	swm fees are supposed to be spent on drainage control not fish restoration	Revised Chapter 7 to clarify this.
21.2	funding	supports more funding; new fees and taxes ok if needed	No decision requested - supports more funding
22.3	funding	fund basin stewards for all tier 1s's	No revisions -- already in plan. See Chapter 7.
24.1	funding	support funding at 50% more	No decision requested - supports more funding
24.2	funding	reinstate basin stewards	No revisions -- already in plan. See Chapter 7.
25.3	funding	fund basin stewards for all tier 1s's	No revisions -- already in plan. See Chapter 7.
32.03	funding	unknown whether funding increase is what is needed, since not tied to goals. need contingency for if SRFB goes away	No revisions -- already in plan. See chapters 7 and 8. See also discussion of developing goals in Chapter 4.
33.09	funding	plan funding should address keeping existing programs going, such as PBRs	No revisions -- supports plan.
33.14	funding	set priorities for existing KC funds	No revisions -- already in plan. See chapters 7 and 8. Up to local governments to direct internal implementation.
39.3	funding	how will dollars be spent?	No revisions - options for spending already in plan
45.8	funding	property tax reductions should be on list of funding options list. Include process for charitable groups to participate by providing funds.	Revised Chapter 7 to include this option.
47.09	funding	not clear whether local government funding (p 2) would include the same level of interlocal agreement cost share assessments	This is an issue for the Forum to discuss as they will determine whether to have another interlocal agreement
52.24	funding	funding needs to discuss benefits derived from existing base, and does not relate to recovery objectives, and does not discuss using mitigation as vehicle for plan implementation	No revisions -- already in plan. See Chapter 8
54.1	funding	supports increased funding strategy	no decision requested - no further action needed
53.04	funding	basinwides could be implemented on voluntary basis by jurisdictions as alternative to basinwide stewards. land trust organizations should be organized to facilitate the actions	No revisions -- will need further discussion among local governments on commitments and implementation.
9.2	funding/commitments	KC should dedicate more open space monies to acquiring riparian urban land	No revisions -- up to local governments to direct internal implementation.
22.2	funding/commitments	supports increased funding recommendations and sources, contingent on government's use of regulatory tools	Comment noted in chapter on commitments
4.1	general action	habitat protection/restoration is imperative	No revisions requested by commenter
4.2	general action	impose harvest moratorium for next 10 years	No revisions - outside the scope of plan
4.3	general action	what is plan for Coal Creek?	No revisions - tier 3 creeks don't have specific plans
7.1	general action	well done product, like action list in chap 9	No revisions - already in plan
8.1	general action	hats off to everyone; agree with need to restore/protect salmon	No revisions - already in plan
8.2	general action	must act now to protect forest, riparian areas in the long term, e.g., Boeing redevelopment area, rural habitat areas (e.g., buy Cedar riparian area, allow flooding)	No revisions - already in plan
12.1	general action	plan is costly and these actions are not needed, especially in Sammamish River	No revisions - inconsistent with conservation strategy
22.4, 25.4	general action	support cold creek study/concern about water withdrawals, sammamish river as tier 1	No revisions- already in plan
33.08	general action	use landowners instead of "homeowners" in referring to actions	Revised throughout document where appropriate
49.6	general action	allocate funds for weed control as part of project costs,	No revisions -- already in plan. See Steering Committee decisions 1/12/05.
32.02	commitments	need clear strategies to implement regulatory and policy recommendations. Need structure to implement and obtain commitments. Benchmarks and triggers	Comment noted in chapter on commitments
3.1	land use	require enforcement of existing regulations before enacting new ones	No revisions - already in plan; comment noted Chap 5
5.1	land use	defend the exempt well state law	No revisions - outside scope of plan
7.2	land use	address SR-520 and I-405 watershed impacts including stormwater, increased impervious area, and culverts	Revised Chapter 9, Cedar, NLW, migratory

# WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

8.3	land use	restrict and stop urban growth	No revisions - outside scope of plan; comment noted Chap 5
9.1	land use	require septic tanks be pumped and inspected every 5 years	No revisions - see SC decision 1/19/05
11.2	land use	density transfer doesn't always work; encourage clustering with bonuses; don't eliminate density with Low Impact Development	No revisions - already in plan
11.3	land use	Need to decrease road widths	No revisions - already in plan
11.4	land use	Increase densities to support mass transit	No revisions - already in plan
13.1	land use	link the plan to GMA and the overall vision for accommodating growth	No revisions - already in plan
13.2	land use	comprehensive detention needed	No revisions - already in plan
13.3	land use	Use CAO's to accommodate growing community and protect environment, by full approach of solutions	No revisions - already in plan
13.4	land use	North Creek must be lab for recovery--use DOE management plan	Revised comprehensive list, action N71
16.3	land use	supports reach 14 actions, but action needs support of CAO enforcement, and financial support for Adaptive Management	No revisions - already in plan; comment noted Chap 5
22.6, 25.6	land use	jurisdictions need to use plan to influence all government decisions at landscape scale--transportation, drinking water, development	Comment noted in chapter on commitments
24.5	land use	enforce LU rules strictly for schools/churches	No revisions - already in plan; comment noted Chap 5
25.4	land use	support cold creek study/concern about water withdrawals, sammamish river as tier 1	No revisions - supports plan
30.1	land use	jurisdictions need to change LU regulations--spending more dollars on projects won't save salmon	No revisions - already in plan; comment noted Chap 5
32.04	land use	CAO important tool- SC should advocate for regulations watershedwide	No revisions - already in plan; comment noted Chap 5
32.1, 43.02	land use	pursue designation of Outstanding National Resource Water for high quality waters in w/s	Revised comprehensive list, actions C4, N1 (already in I18)
32.12, 43.3	land use	plan should prohibit gravel mining	Revised comprehensive list, added to "actions for future analysis"
33.04	land use	develop procedure and strategy requiring local governments to weigh impacts of large-scale development and road projects on plan goal	Comment noted in commitments chapter
33.06	land use	plan should support forest stewardship and KC programs	Revised comp list and Chap 9
33.17	land use	incorporate various ag and forestry program techniques into action list	Revised comp list and Chap 9
33.18	land use	retrofit swm facilities that have been rendered ineffective..	No revisions - see SC decision 1/19/05
33.19	land use	follow up on complaint process	Revised comprehensive list, added to "actions for future analysis"
33.2	land use	better enforcement of water withdrawals	Revised Chapter 9, Cedar, NLW, Issaquah
36.4	land use	don't encourage overlapping and duplicative stormwater regs	Revised Chapter 9, all populations; comment noted Chap 5
36.5	land use	land use regs should be tailored to actual salmon life-cycle functions	No revisions - proposed actions are linked to life history stages in Conservation Strategy
38.2	land use	use incentives instead of regulations	No revisions - already in plan
40	land use	make sure DOE and DOA are involved in this plan--they are allowing application of herbicides that are inconsistent with plan	Revised comprehensive list, actions C41 and N66 (see 1/19/05 SC decisions)
43.3	land use	adopt regulations that provide for comprehensive review of proposed gravel mining	Revised comprehensive list, added to "actions for future analysis"
44.4	land use	requests recommendations for specific buffer widths	No revisions - W8TC determined this was not appropriate [see chap 5, App D-6]
45.5	land use	plan needs to address whether treatment of runoff from 520 will be addressed	Revised Chapter 9, Cedar, NLW, migratory
45.7	land use	clarify discussion about buffers	No revisions - W8TC determined this was not appropriate [see chap 5, App D-6]
47.03	land use	describe impact of GMA and SMP implementation on habitat	No revisions - cannot describe impacts until commitments known
47.08, 47.11	land use	indicate 520 impacts on p 11 of Chapter 9.	Revised Chapter 9, Cedar, NLW, migratory
47.12	public outreach	Chapter 10, page 5, reference impacts of proposed actions on lakefront property owners	No revisions -- addressed in existing actions.
50.6	land use	not clear what landowners can do with their properties now that CAOs in place	No revisions - depends in what jurisdiction landowner is located; comment noted Chap 5

# WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

52.01	land use	mention need for future development to be low impact. Describe how low impact can be beneficial to developer and public	Revised Chapter 9, NLW. Revised Executive Summary
52.02, 52.12	land use	Sno Cty Sustainable development task force should be mentioned as a model (comments are for chapter 1 mission and goals, but can't amend those)	Revised Chapter 9, NLW
52.06	land use	reference Ecology Stormwater manual	No revisions - already in plan
52.13	land use	North Creek will likely become Tier 3 due to urban development. Actions on tier 3 list should be linked to other tiers...	No revisions - all Tier 3 actions are also included in Tiers 1 and 2
52.15	land use	watershed wide recommendations should rise to a higher level in order to stem further decline due to urban development	No revisions - comment noted Chap 5
52.16	land use	various land use recommendations in chapter 10 are beyond the scope of current policy alternatives being considered by Snohomish County --please delete or revise (there are examples)	See SC decisions for 1/12/05 and 1/19/05 for details (some revisions made, others were not)
53.05	land use	Renton regulations already strict on floodplain development, but in urban area can't prohibit new development outright. Not clear what coordination with KC flood plan means	Revised comp lists and Chap 9
53.06	land use	more flexible language desired regarding retrofits of existing roads for stormwater runoff	No revisions - land use actions are voluntary
53.07	land use	protecting trees beyond required for CAOs conflicts with density targets. Benefits of having street tree program is questionable.	Revised action C3 - see SC decision 1/12/05
53.08	land use	what does strive for regulatory consistency mean? Renton and KC each developed CAO based on BAS. change c9 to be basinwide action---all jurisdictions should develop CAOs based on ...	Revised action C9 and throughout comp list - see SC decision 1/19/05
53.1	land use	c12 should apply to all jurisdictions. all areas should have equivalent standards to protect wq and runoff. Adopt and enforces sw regs as part of NPDES permit requirements	Revised Chapter 9 and comp lists, all populations
53.11	land use	c14 - retrofitting of roadways can happen only when funding available	No revisions - already in plan
53.12	land use	c15 - Renton supports this action--Public Works has adopted the regional road maintenance ESA program guidelines	No revisions - supports plan
53.13	land use	delete c 21 - very little area in S. KC Groundwater management area. Not helpful towards managing resources	No revisions - see SC decision 1/19/05
53.14	land use	c24 and App d, page 5. clarify what is meant by promote water conservation through permitting processes	Revised action C24 and App D
53.15	land use	c25 - delete, goes beyond scope of what jurisdictions can do	No revisions - see SC decision 1/19/05
53.21	land use	what is justification for larger buffers than Best Available Science in tier 1 urban areas?	No revisions - actions are voluntary in menu
53.22	land use	change prohibit floodplain development to limit or minimize	Revisions made to Chapter 9, Chapter 10, App. D
53.23	land use	recognize high density neighborhoods may not be able to be retrofitted with natural drainage systems	Revised App D
53.24	land use	what does improve data on water rights mean? Outside the scope of local authority	No revisions - see SC decision 1/12/05
53.25	land use	exempt wells - need legislature to change the law, otherwise prohibiting them is a take	No revisions - see SC decision 1/12/05
53.26	land use	water suppliers should look into working together to shift supply from one source to another to protect instream flows--not accepted by DOE, so outside scope of local authority	Revised App D
53.27	land use	work with local groundwater protection committees--what are benefits? Renton has not received assistance from these in the past, has developed substantial groundwater aquifer program on its own.	No revisions - see SC decision 1/19/05
53.28	land use	use more flexible word in lieu of prohibit any variances	No revisions - actions are voluntary in menu
53.29	land use	since each jurisdiction should develop CAO based on its own Best Available Science, why are KC standards mentioned?	Revisions made to Appendix D, part 6
53.31	land use	focus on KC's land use code as model strengthens perception that shared staff more intent on KC needs than WRIA needs	Revisions made to Appendix D, part 6



# WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

53.32	land use	check our text on page 2 against Steering Committee guidance provided spring 2004 for accuracy	No revisions - the text is accurate
53.38	land use	table d -3-1.- modify various text to be less strong,	Revisions made to Appendix D, part 5
53.39	land use	land use policies in plan should not be required if one size fits all	No revisions - land use actions are voluntary
53.4	land use	incentives for riparian vegetation may be more successful than regulations. Concern no commitment for funding for any of the actions	Revised Chapter 9, Cedar
53.41	land use	c26 - BAS issue - also mentioned in chapter 8.	Revised comp lists, actions C9, C26, N49, I51
53.42	land use	c27 -Renton already doing this	No revision - supports plan
53.48	land use	commitments shouldn't prohibit Renton from implementing their growth targets.	No revision - plan calls for GMA growth targets to be implemented
53.49	land use	revise c 1 and c 3	Revised C1 (editorial); revised C3 - see SC decision 1/12/05
53.5	land use	c38 is unrealistic	No revision - see C3 revision
54.2	funding	supports basin stewards for each tier 1 area	No revisions -- see Chapter 7.
54.6	land use	forest cover loss and groundwater withdrawals should be stopped	No revisions - already in plan
8.4	land use, po	make more actions for business and homeowners mandatory and then enforce (e.g., car washes, land use laws)	Comment noted in Chap 5
22.5. 25.5	monitoring	supports multi-species effort/data collection	no decision requested - outside the scope of plan; Steering Cmte could recommend on future work program; monitoring does cover ecosystem
32.02	monitoring	need clear strategies to implement regulatory and policy recommendations. Need structure to implement and obtain commitments. Benchmarks and triggers	Revised Chapter 6, see intro in particular. No change in Chapter 8 -- local governments need to discuss and decide how to ratify.
33.1	monitoring	implement basin-wide monitoring program of WQ; include nontraditional data	No revisions -- already in plan. See Chapter 6 and Appendix C-3.
35.3	monitoring	monitoring program needs pre-determined suite of responses, thresholds, etc	Revised Chapter 6.
45.9	monitoring	figure out how to track volunteer hours to show the real costs of projects. Include annually on web site and annual report	No revisions. Annual progress report discussed in Chapter 2 will need to be scoped once plan is ratified.
52.07	monitoring	monitoring should include success at involving development community in Low Impact Development	Revised Chapter 6 -- specific implementation monitoring plan is expected to be scoped in 2005-06.
54.4	monitoring	need to collect data on other species	no action requested -Outside scope of plan - habitat information will be from throughout WRIA 8, but population data will focus on Chinook
56.1	monitoring	Need to "market" the need for system scale monitoring - primarily tangible, quantifiable measures of chinook survival - adult spawner surveys, outmigrant traps, and lock counts (improved, if possible). evaluations of flows and habitat, too. predation in the lake - wants measures that evaluate the success of fish leaving WRIA 8	Revised Chapter 6 to insert riparian index as potential option under cumulative monitoring. Chapter 6 also includes specific measures of Chinook survival.
33.13	organizational structure	communicating progress function should include landowners	Revision made.
33.16	organizational structure	is it more appropriate to have one executive director for all wrias and keep coordinators for each wria?	No revisions -- see Steering Committee key decisions for 1/19/05.
45.1	organizational structure	need shared staff to provide assistance to implement the plan	No revisions -- already in plan.
47.05	organizational structure	concur with proposed org structure--but since current SC, Forum and W8TC are working effectively, why change it?	No revisions -- see Steering Committee key decisions for 1/19/05.
53.46	organizational structure	new bureaucracy being created - concern jurisdictions won't have enough representation- other requests for clarification	No revisions -- will need further discussion among local governments on com
54.5	organizational structure	supports Adaptive Management timeline	No revision - already in plan
13.5	process	Include participation of development community	No revisions: Development community represented on Steering Committee and participate on all working committees. Master Builders was invited to participate
21.1	process	fully endorses plan, particularly Adaptive Management process	No revisions -- supports plan.
22.1	process	move plan through Forum and to jurisdictions quickly to keep momentum going	No revisions
23.1	process	pleased with overall quality/quantity of plan	No revisions -- supports plan.

WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

24.4	process	broaden plan to all species	No revisions- may address other species through adaptive management
24.6	process	support plan overall, and Adaptive Management approach	No revisions -- supports plan.
31.1	process	need clean waters and fish friendly streams	No revisions - already in plan
31.2	process	need cost-benefit analysis to make sure dollars spent efficiently	No revisions - cost estimates already in plan; relative benefits of actions to be analyzed in 2005; use adaptive management process to incorporate new information
31.3	process	implementation must be science-based and include stakeholder input	No revisions - already in plan
31.5	process	need more time to comment	No revisions - Steering Committee approved staying on current schedule. New information will be incorporated through adaptive management
32.05	process	scope of plan should be ecosystem based, multi-species approach	No revisions - plan takes ecosystem approach; additional species may be addressed in future
33.01	process	supports science, Adaptive Management, other	No revisions - supports plan
33.11	process	extinction of Kokonee could be used to underscore vulnerability of Chinook on the Cedar	Revised chapter 1
33.15	process	include landowners w/ restoration experience in action committees	Revised chapter 2
33.21	process	include reach maps	No revisions - reach maps provided in electronic form on web site
35.2	process	no faith that shared strategy process will work	No revisions- outside scope of plan
36.1	process	extend comment period 30 days	No revisions - Steering Committee approved staying on current schedule. New information will be incorporated through adaptive management
44.1	process	plan approval should be delayed until genetics study completed	No revisions - see 1/19/05 Steering Committee decisions
47.01	process	strongly support efforts to restore/improve salmon habitat	No revisions - commenter is not requesting any changes
50.1	process	not enough time to review this document	No revisions - Steering Committee approved staying on current schedule. New information will be incorporated through adaptive management
51.1	process	delay the plan until genetics study completed	No revisions - Steering Committee approved staying on current schedule. New information will be incorporated through adaptive management
51.3	process	chinook centric plan is ignoring value of many smaller streams. Prefer a multi-species approach	No revisions - plan is ecosystem-based with Chinook focus. Habitat modeling includes coho. Propose to monitor habitat for multiple species.
52.34	process	plan is well organized. In general, clearly addresses marine nearshore habitat.	No revisions - supports plan
35.1	process	plan lacks measurable goals for protection and restoration, and timetables for compliance	Revised Chapter 3 to include targets proposed by Washington State Fish and Wildlife
53.45	process	recommendation to change mission statement	No revisions - outside scope of plan
36.2	provide more information	plan should better clarify difference between plan goals of plan (restore harvestable pops) and ESA (do no harm)	No revisions - outside scope of plan
36.3	provide more information	assess how critical habitat policy redefines critical habitat and thus our policy recommendations	No revisions - Steering Committee sent letter to NOAA describing concerns related to proposed policy. Once policy is finalized, can address need for course corrections through adaptive management
39.6	provide more information	wolf creek is spelled wolfe; not sure if correct category; clarify description of project ; clarify feasibility, since seattle is in favor;	Revised - made corrections and clarifications to M250
39.7, 39.8	provide more information	add the following bullet on Chapter 5, page 6, under ship canal: "restore riparian vegetation and freshwater mixing zone to provide cover and refuge to Chinook downstream of Locks"	no decision requested - can add clarifying text
39.9	provide more information	where does wolfe creek fit in Appendix c-4?	No revision - Wolfe Creek is in a Tier 3 sub-area, while the mouth of the creek is considered part of the Tier 1 nearshore / estuary sub-area.

WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

46.1, 46.2	provide more information	fatal flaw in plan is that no cost-benefit analysis of actions done---means prioritization is not based outcome	No revisions - cost estimates already in plan; relative benefits of actions to be analyzed in 2005; use adaptive management process to incorporate new information
47.02	provide more information	include impacts of major transportation and other projects anticipated in the 10 year time frame:	no decision requested - can describe potential impacts generically
52.08	provide more information	include benefits of sustainable stormwater management in funding chapter	No revision - is already in plan (D-3-2)
52.09	provide more information	sustainable development task force could be mentioned as example to highlight quality of life and economic benefits of Low Impact Development	No revision -- see Appendix D, Part 6.
52.21	provide more information	add reference to Snohomish county stewards in chapter 5	no decision requested - can add clarifying text
52.31	provide more information	unclear will King Co. beach bluff study extend into Sno Cty?	Revised text - answer is yes
52.37	provide more information	construction of the railroad and its impacts is not listed anywhere in the document.	No revision - already in Chapter 3 of plan
15.1	public outreach	Sammamish River Trail should be main site for public outreach.	No revision -use of trails already referred to for outreach potential., but no site should be listed as "main site for public outreach actions. See SC decision on 1/19/05
15.2	public outreach	better coordination w/in jurisdictions and between jurisdictions and noxious weed control agencies needed	No revision -- already in plan, more funding issue
20	public outreach	continue salmon education programs for younger students--explore alternatives to hatchery plantings	No revision - already in plan
33.12	public outreach	need more landowner support and engagement	No revision - supports plan
33.29	public outreach	add cedar river naturalist program	Revision -oversight amended and action added as per SC approval 1/19/2005
52.05	public outreach	prioritization of outreach actions could include opportunities to reach out to builders education and outreach most effectively coordinated through Sno Cty outreach and stewards	No decision requested - the word "builders" added to sentence in Ch 5, p. 14, under prioritization
52.11	public outreach		No revision - already in plan
52.14	public outreach	public outreach actions should mention task force; stewards	No decision requested - clarifying text added
53.2	public outreach	good list of outreach actions--unlikely to implement all. Consider asking locals to implement those that would give most benefit, such as those that support continued expenditure of public funds for restoration and protection actions and link between land use and habitat	No decision requested - consistent with plan
52.35	request for clarification	description of northern boundary of WRIA 8 is wrong	Revised Chapters 1, 3 and Executive Summary --northern limits is in Mukilteo
52.36	request for clarification	be explicit that 50% of marine shoreline is in Sno Cty	Revised Executive Summary and Chapter 1
52.17	request for clarification	change reference to habitat objectives, since we don't have them	Revised Chapter 1
52.18	request for clarification	various text changes recommended to chapter 3.. (10 examples)	no decision requested- can add clarifying text
52.19	request for clarification	various text changes recommended to chapter 4. (16 examples)	no decision requested- can add clarifying text
52.2	request for clarification	recommends changes to integration map to show project opportunities in nearshore for Snohomish Counties	No revisions - the migratory and Rearing areas maps depicts examples of opportunities for nearshore projects in Snohomish County. Map scale does not allow identification of every project opportunity

WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

1.1	site-specific	concern about impacts to salmon of Sammamish Rowing Club in Marymoor West	No revision - see SC decision Jan. 12th.
2.1	site-specific	provide wildlife habitat at Lakeshore Landing Development, connect to Gene Coulon Park	No revision - see SC decision Jan. 19
2.2	site-specific	City of Renton should preserve last natural shoreline on Lk Wash and streams entering it	No revision - covered by plan already
6.1	site-specific	address remote site salmon incubators	No revision - Outside scope of plan - focus is on habitat. Forward comment to Co-Managers
8.5	site-specific	protect old Black River, birds	No revision - bird habitat is outside scope and wetland recommendations apply to Black River
11.6	site-specific	don't put logs in Sammamish River because it is used for transportation purposes	Revised text - added caveat about using LWD safely to intro Chap. 9, 10; see SC decision Jan. 19
12.3	site-specific	LWD and rock additions to Sammamish River are hazardous, not needed	Revised text - added caveat about using LWD safely to intro Chap. 9, 10; see SC decision Jan. 19
12.4	site-specific	redo the weir and pump cold water to fix the Sammamish River temperature problem	No revision - Sammamish River experts considered but did not recommend this action.
17.1, 18.1, 19.1	site-specific	Placement of LWD needs to ensure boater safety (with specific recommendations for how)	Revised text - added caveat about using LWD safely to intro Chap. 9, 10; see SC decision Jan. 19
23.2	site-specific	add five projects to North Creek	See SC decision for Jan. 12th, added projects to addendum for future analysis
24.3	site-specific	support Cold Creek aquifer study and Samm R restoration actions	No revision - supports plan
27.1	site-specific	don't put logs in Sammamish River because it is used for transportation purposes	Revised text - added caveat about using LWD safely to intro Chap. 9, 10; see SC decision Jan. 19
28.1	site-specific	alter fish ladders for more gradual salinity change	No revision - already in plan
32.11	site-specific	remove blockages--American Rivers can help with funding, tech assistance, etc.	Revision: added review of database of dams to addendum for future analysis
33.22	site-specific	add disclaimer that no engineering done for the projects	Revision - added caveat about most projects needing feasibility and design to intro. Chap. 9, 10
33.23	site-specific	move bucks curve out of UGA	Revision- made correction
33.24	site-specific	add 3 Cedar River protection projects to start list	See SC decision Jan. 12th, added protection project to Cedar start list, Dorre Don Meanders (now C250,. C253)
33.25	site-specific	C216 (now C214) is two separate actions	Revision - changed Cedar start list to reference both projects C215, C216 (now C213, C214)
33.26	site-specific	scope of C215 (now C213) unclear	Revision - added clarifying language
33.27	site-specific	take C216 (now C214) off start list	See SC decision Jan. 12th, kept on start list
33.28	site-specific	add 9 Cedar River restoration actions to startlist	See SC decision Jan. 12th, not added to start list.
37	site-specific	plan should address need to continue and expand parks and open space, promote public access to gain plan support	no revision - add to list for future analysis, since would need to research public access policies of jurisdictions
38.1	site-specific	make sure LWD is safe	Revised text - see SC decision Jan. 19; added caveat about using LWD safely to intro Chap. 9, 10
41.1	site-specific	3 wild card projects in Lake Sammamish	See SC decision Jan. 12th, added 2 projects to start list - mouth of Zacusse and Ebright Creeks restoration
48.1	site-specific	specific text corrections to site-specific migratory list	Revision - made corrections to migratory project descriptions
49.1	site-specific	Areas disturbed during project implementation on the Sammamish River are at high risk of loosestrife invasion. Need to bolster eradication efforts using coordinated approach involving all landowners	No revision - See SC decision Jan. 12th, already in plan and covered by other programs
49.2	site-specific	Kelsey Creek/Richards Creek harbors largest infestation of policeman's helmet in KC. Need to bolster eradication in coordinated manner	No revision - See SC decision Jan. 12th, already in plan and covered by other programs
49.3	site-specific	Japanese knotweed infestation on lower Cedar. Patches next to proposed restoration projects should be included in plans. Also problem in headwaters	No revision - See SC decision Jan. 12th, already in plan and covered by other programs

WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

52.1	site-specific	Little Bear needs more beavers and LWD	See SC decision Jan. 19th, beaver issue added to addendum for future analysis; LWD for Little Bear is already in plan
52.25, 52.3	site-specific	make clear that nearshore project proposals are not based on the modeling efforts , therefore there is no consistency in terms of technical documentation...	Revision - added clarifying text in Chap. 9
52.27	site-specific	N367 - question as to whether really furthering plan benefits? Should other North Creek actions be added?	See SC decision Jan. 12th, no change N367, added N379 to start list
52.28	site-specific	why no Little Bear reach 1 projects on start list? Suggestions for additions	See SC decision Jan. 12th, no addition to start list
52.29	site-specific	action n377 is the same as n373	Revision - reference both on start list
52.32	site-specific	Take m222 off list, add culvert replacement at Lund's Gulch Creek	See SC decision Jan. 12th, no change
53.02	site-specific	note that opportunities in Cedar River reach 1 and 2 are very limited	Revision - added clarifying text to project notes in Reach 1, 2
53.09	public outreach	c10 applies to more than just KC and Renton. Renton doesn't actively remove LWD from river, only under safety situations. Change to a public outreach action to educate recreational boaters to reduce demand from public to remove it.	Revision made.
53.16	site-specific	c209 (now C208) - floodplain buyouts on their own, without restoration, do not have significant to salmon. Question using regional funds for piecemeal buyout. Should be part of a comprehensive restoration of an area	See SC decision Jan. 19th, added clarifying text to site specific Cedar River projects including flood buyouts
53.17	site-specific	c213- does not support modifications to Elliott levee-please remove	See SC decision Jan. 12th, removed c213 from Comprehensive List
53.18	site-specific	please add new spawning and rearing channel project in reach 3	See Steering Committee decision Jan. 19, not added to Comp List
53.19	site-specific	please add new landsburg gravel supplementation project in reach 18	See Steering Committee decision Jan. 19, not added to Comp List
53.34	site-specific	c204 (now C203)- note Cedar River Trail is in this section of river	Revision - added clarifying text to project notes
53.35	site-specific	c216 (now C214) - inconsistency with project description in 9 and 10 - city wants setback levee language included	Revision - added clarifying text to project description in Chap. 10, prioritized list of Cedar Site Specific Restoration projects
53.36	site-specific	c269 (now C266)- supports project is meets design intent for recreational opportunities	No revision - already in plan
53.37	site-specific	c268 (now C266) - concern may reduce recreational opportunities	Revision - added clarifying language to project notes
53.43	site-specific	prioritization of actions table - varied levels of feasibility	No revision, no change requested - seemed to be an observation
53.44	site-specific	likes notes, key uncertainties statements - reference elsewhere?	No revision - inconsistent with format of the plan
53.51	site-specific	requests C202 to be removed from Comprehensive List and C201 to be revised to not call for reduction of channel confinement	See SC decision Jan. 19th - C202 removed from list; C201 not revised as requested, but clarifying text added to project notes
54.3	site-specific	supports projects to increase forage and refuge on Sammamish River	No revision - supports plan
55	site-specific	remove beaver dams that obstruct fish passage	See SC decision Jan. 19th, added to addendum for future analysis
53.3	site-specific	acknowledge expectation that jurisdictions will not want recreational opportunities in parks diminished due to habitat improvements	Revisions made -- clarifying text added to site-specific projects.
10.1	technical	Locks is a bottle-neck due to increased competition and for space and food. Direct resources to other rivers and streams in the region where there is potential for significant improvements.	No revision - recent studies do not support this hypothesis.
10.2	technical	replace flap gates	No revision - does not apply to WRIA 8
11.7	technical	do heavy metal contaminants in the Sammamish need to be dredged?	No revision - Sammamish sediment study concluded is not needed
14.1	technical	why isn't Mcaleer Creek rated higher?	No revision - responded by email to commenter
16.1	technical	supports conservation hypotheses and prioritization of NLW based on restoration/preservation potential	No revision - supports plan
16.2	technical	supports concern over hatchery influences	No revision - supports plan
29.1	technical	use fishing regulations to reduce predatore populations	No revision - plan currently recommends that increases in fishing limits be considered by appropriate agencies.
30.2	technical	fish enter Greenes Stream when May Creek floods - check it out	No revision - checked factual information
32.01	technical	plan lacks measurable goals for protection and restoration	Revised - options for long-term abundance objectives included in Chapter 4.
32.06	technical	study potential interactions of sockeye hatchery releases on attacking predators to Chinook	1/12 - add language from City of Seattle

WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

32.07	technical	include analysis Cedar HCP to ensure it is meeting salmon passage requirements and adequate instream flow levels	1/12 - add language from City of Seattle
32.08	technical	consider connection of hatchery/harvest to ESA recovery mandate.	No revision. Outside scope of plan - focus is on habitat. Comment should go to Co-Managers. Potential hatchery operation scenarios are included in current draft.
32.09	technical	include measures to set and achieve ecologically based stream flows	No revision - evaluation of actions and potential flow objectives will be evaluated during 2005.
33.02	technical	needs to include language reflecting need for analysis of future flows and strategy to address	No decision requested- evaluation of actions and potential flow objectives will be evaluated during 2005.
33.03	technical	requests calculation and inclusion of benchmark habitat conditions for lowland trib. Subbasins as part of multi-species approach	No decision requested - general habitat objectives are described in Ch 4 and will be refined during 2005.
33.05	technical	lack of restoration projects in Issaquah will result in adverse impacts on habitat forming processes for coho and Kokanee	1/12, 1/19 - outside Chinook-focused scope, but addressed thru 'wildcards'
34.1	technical	consequences of aquatic weed eradication programs	No decision requested - technical recommendations include aquatic weed eradication
35.4	technical	conservation measures need to be coordinated with h's.	No revision - Outside scope of plan - focus is on habitat. Forward comment to Co-Managers. Potential hatchery operation scenarios are included in current draft.
36.6	technical	identify how reduction in predation by non-native fish can be part of restoration	No decision requested - current draft includes recommendations to reduce abundance and efficacy of predators, these actions will be evaluated during 2005
36.7	technical	do escapement index estimates for 2004	No decision requested - will revise
39.5	technical	funnel strategy for prioritizaion	No decision requested - commenter's strategy is consistent with the W8TC's 'Scenario C' where there is one population in WRIA 8. Until the genetics report is received the SC has recommended the current conservative approach to populations in WRIA 8
43.1	technical	describe steps needed to achieve adequate instream flows	No decision requested - addressed thru 2005 work program
44.2	technical	delete recommendation that Issaquah restoration be on hold; reprioritization needed	No revisions -- see Steering Committee key decisions for 1/19/05.
44.3	technical	model should be updated to include recent streamside studies sponsored by Issaquah	No decision requested - part of adaptive management process
45.4	technical	plan should point out cases where bulkheads may be beneficial in reducing fine sediment	No decision requested - could be addressed during treatment phase of T
45.6	technical	plan should address whether invasive aquatic weeds pose threat to salmon fry	No decision requested - could be addressed during treatment phase of T
47.04	technical	recognize work of community groups that have installed incubators	No action requested - potential positive and negative impacts of incubators should be evaluated and described by Co-Managers
47.06	technical	clarify what we know about migratory patterns between canal to east LK WA shoreline - Medina to Kirkland	No decision requested - will revise
47.07	technical	habitat restoration hypotheses for NLW chinook do not include impact of 520. Should construction constraints be imposed during migration?	no decision requested - can describe potential impacts generically
49.4	technical	describe link between invasive species control and healthier salmon habitat. Recognize as source of degradation,	No decision requested - could be addressed during treatment phase of T
50.2	technical	questions prioritization by population and tier--relation to hatchery infections, other issues	No decision requested - disease addressed as part of EDT model, IHN from sockeye is not communicable to Chinook, per WDFW
50.3	technical	four h's not relevant in this wria. Predation is bigger factor	No decision requested- Habitat is key responsibility of local governments and has been shown thru technical work to date to be significant factor limiting Chinook. Habitat actions can reduce predator abundance and efficacy.
50.4	technical	need summary of ongoing research projects and agency responsible	No decision requested by SC - much of this is in monitoring chapter; research agenda will come of adaptive management process

WRIA 8 CHINOOK SALMON CONSERVATION PLAN: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Actual comments were used when recommendations were made on how to incorporate the comments into the plan.

50.5	technical	other miscellaneous issues related to technical chapters	No decision requested - will provide clarifying text
51.2	technical	supports changes to hatchery operations to reduce competition, HSRG efforts and federal agencies looking at this issue	No revisions - supports plan
51.4	technical	information left out of EDT model. What assurances will be incorporated in next plan draft?	No revisions- Technical Committee is committed to updating EDT to reflect Issaquah information, and plans to update the model on a regular basis as new habitat information is available
52.03	technical	clarify reference to Swamp Creek having moderate probability of spawning, north creek not mentioned much	No decision requested- will add clarifying text
52.22	technical	insert reference for index of riparian integrity	No decision requested- will add clarifying text
52.23	technical	change text on validation monitoring	No decision requested- will add clarifying text
52.38	technical	6 recommendations for changes to text--limiting factors, etc.	No decision requested- will add clarifying text
52.39	technical	role of dungeness crab larvae	No decision requested- outside scope of plan
52.4	technical	table 4-4 cedar recommendations is an excellent menu for nearshore actions, other comments of support	No decision requested- will add clarifying text
53.01	technical	better description of system is needed	No decision requested- already in plan